National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Branch
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction des acquisitions et des services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE PHENOMENOLOGY OF MEN'S INTIMATE PARTNER ABUSE: THE HEART OF THE MATTER

BY

KENNETH B. HARRISON

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND

RESEARCH IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

IN

COUNSELLING PSYCHOLOGY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1995

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

THE AUTHOR HAS GRANTED AN IRREVOCABLE NON-EXCLUSIVE LICENCE ALLOWING THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA TO REPRODUCE, LOAN, DISTRIBUTE OR SELL COPIES OF HIS/HER THESIS BY ANY MEANS AND IN ANY FORM OR FORMAT, MAKING THIS THESIS AVAILABLE TO INTERESTED PERSONS.

L'AUTEUR A ACCORDE UNE LICENCE IRREVOCABLE ET NON EXCLUSIVE PERMETTANT A LA BIBLIOTHEQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA DE REPRODUIRE, PRETER, DISTRIBUER OU VENDRE DES COPIES DE SA THESE DE QUELQUE MANIERE ET SOUS QUELQUE FORME QUE CE SOIT POUR METTRE DES EXEMPLAIRES DE CETTE THESE A LA DISPOSITION DES PERSONNE INTERESSEES.

THE AUTHOR RETAINS OWNERSHIP OF THE COPYRIGHT IN HIS/HER THESIS. NEITHER THE THESIS NOR SUBSTANTIAL EXTRACTS FROM IT MAY BE PRINTED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED WITHOUT HIS/HER PERMISSION.

L'AUTEUR CONSERVE LA PROPRIETE DU DROIT D'AUTEUR QUI PROTEGE SA THESE. NI LA THESE NI DES EXTRAITS SUBSTANTIELS DE CELLE-CI NE DOIVENT ETRE IMPRIMES OU AUTREMENT REPRODUITS SANS SON AUTORISATION.

ISBN 0-612-06398-4

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Kenneth B. Harrison

TITLE OF THESIS: The Phenomenology of Men's Intimate Partner Abuse: The Heart of The Matter.

DEGREE: Master of Education

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1995

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

50-52343 Range Road 211

Sherwood Park, AB

T8G 1A6

Date: 95/09/29

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled The Phenomenology of Men's Intimate Partner Abuse: The Heart of The Matter

submitted by Kenneth B. Harrison

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education in Counselling Psychology.

D. T. Shannon-Brady

L. L. Stewin

C. J. Bullock

Date: 95/09/20

Abstract

The persistence of psychological and physical abuse of women by their intimate male partners warrants continued pursuit of understanding of this phenomenon. A review of research and theory within Family Violence, Feminist, Intergenerational Transmission, Typology, Personality, and Interpersonal Attachment approaches is reviewed. While this review provides an informative background to partner abuse, absence of consensus among researchers and theorists precludes an unequivocal understanding of the phenomenon.

It is noted that research and theory on intimate partner abuse has generally neglected the direct experience of men who perpetrate such abuse. In the interest of more fully understanding intimate partner abuse, a phenomenological study of men who perpetrate such abuse was undertaken. Five male participants described their experience of intimate partner abuse in an unstructured interview. Thematic analysis revealed an essential structure of the phenomenon marked by Disintegration Despair, Preservation, and Paradoxical Control. This structure was defined more specifically by themes such as Anguish, Repudiation, Anger, Constraint, Attachment, Validation, Nescience, Rumination, Fragile Self, Dependence, External-Material, Urgency, Escape, and Substance Abuse.

The essential structure was discussed in terms of theoretical orientations and research findings. The experiences of these five men were

found to correspond most significantly with features of the Interpersonal Attachment approach to intimate partner abuse and Borderline Personality Organization observed in men who perpetrate such abuse. Suggestions were made for further research to elaborate an Attachment/Borderline approach to understanding intimate partner abuse, and to incorporate the experiences of Disintegration Despair, Preservation, and Paradoxical Control in our understanding and treatment of intimate partner abuse.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Upon completion of this thesis, I am pleased to express gratitude to Dr. D. T. Shannon-Brady for his persistent enthusiasm, and support for this project. I am also indebted to him for a great deal of patience while I wrestled all too long with it. Most importantly, I am grateful to Dustin for permitting me to pursue this project in my own way, unrestrained by other agendas.

I am also clearly in debt to the five men who had the strength and courage to bare their "hearts" to a stranger, and help me understand.

Finally, I am grateful to my wife ElizaBeth, who deserves the last word, for her dedicated support and encouragement throughout.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

UNIT I
CHAPTER ONE: GENERAL INTRODUCTION
The Phenomenon of Intimate Partner Abuse..... 1
The Phenomenon 2

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW
Introduction 6
Sociological Models of Intimate Partner Abuse..... 7
The Family Violence Model of Intimate Partner Abuse 8
In Defense of the Family Violence Model 11
The Feminist Model of Intimate Partner Abuse.....17
In Defense of the Feminist Model.....19

CHAPTER THREE: THE PSYCHOLOGICAL PARADIGM 27
Intergenerational Transmission Theory 28
Research on Intergenerational Transmission 29
Personality-Typology Approach 34
Research on Personality and Typology 35
Typology Research 36
Personality Research 40
Interpersonal Attachment Approach 51
Research on Attachment in Intimate Partner Abuse.....57
Conclusion to Research on Intimate Partner Abuse 67

CHAPTER FOUR: METHODOLOGY
Introduction 70
Method 70
Participants 70
Demographics 71
Procedure 72
Bracketing 74
Data Analysis 76

CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Synthesis of Ian's Experience 79
Summary of Ian's Experience 84
Synthesis of Peter's Experience 89
Summary of Peter's Experience 96
Synthesis of Jack's Experience 101
Summary of Jack's Experience 107
Synthesis of Lawrence's Experience 111

Summary of Lawrence's Experience....119
Synthesis of Rick's Experience....123
Summary of Rick's Experience....127
Across-Persons Thematic Analysis....130
Across-Persons Higher Order Cluster Analysis....137
The Essence of Men's Abuse Experiences....138
Strengths and Limitations of the Study....143
Sampling....143
Reliability....144
Validity....145

CHAPTER SIX: GENERAL DISCUSSION
Introduction....148
Implications for Sociological Models....149
Implications for Intergenerational Transmission....153
Implications for the Personality/Typology Approach....154
Implications for the Interpersonal Attachment Approach....157
Attachment/Borderline Experience in Intimate Partner Abuse....160
Implications for Future Research....163
Conclusion....164

REFERENCES....166
APPENDIX 1: Thematic Abstractions of Ian's Experience....177
APPENDIX 2: Thematic Abstractions of Peter's Experience....188
APPENDIX 3: Thematic Abstractions of Jack's Experience....202
APPENDIX 4: Thematic Abstractions of Lawrence's Experience....212
APPENDIX 5: Thematic Abstractions of Rick's Experience....225

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Description	
1:0	First Order Thematic Description of Ian's Experience	86
1:1	Second Order Thematic Description of Ian's Experience	88
2:0	First Order Thematic Description of Peter's Experience	97
2:1	Second Order Thematic Description of Peter's Experience	100
3:0	First Order Thematic Description of Jack's Experience	108
3:1	Second Order Thematic Description of Jack's Experience	110
4:0	First Order Thematic Description of Lawrence's Experience	120
4:1	Second Order Thematic Description of Lawrence's Experience	122
5:0	First Order Thematic Description of Rick's Experience	128
5:1	Second Order Thematic Description of Rick's Experience	129
6:0	Summary and Synthesis of Abuse Themes	140
6:1	Distribution of Themes and Clusters	142

CHAPTER ONE

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The Phenomenon of Intimate Partner Abuse

It is perhaps one of the most disconcerting realities of the human condition, that in the very setting where we are capable of expressing the most intense compassion and creating our strongest bonds, we also appear all too often capable of expressing our most severe disdain and inflicting our greatest harm. This paradoxical condition occurs in primary intimate adult relationships: A setting where our hope might be that it serve as a refuge of security in an otherwise uncertain and sometimes threatening external world. Yet for some, these relationships prove to be painfully insecure and violently abusive. Arguably, it is this paradoxical quality that makes psychological and physical abuse of an adult intimate partner one of the most insidious and challenging problems of human social existence.

In his seminal ethological analysis of aggression, Lorenz (1963, p. 28) concluded that "the readiness to fight is greatest in the most familiar place." Evidently this conclusion is born out in the aggression observed in the familiar ground of many intimate adult relationships. It has been reported that 11% to 12% of American women have experienced some husband-to-wife violence (Gelles & Straus, 1988, pp. 104-109, 250), that 1.6 million women are severely assaulted three times each year (Straus & Gelles, 1986), and an estimated 2,880 women are abused daily (cited in Throne-

Finch, 1992, pp. 9-10). In Canada spouse abuse rates of 8% to 29% have been reported (Alberta Office for the Prevention of Family Violence, 1991; Statistics Canada, 1993).

The Phenomenon Defined

The present discussion and study seeks to extend our understanding of abuse perpetrated by men against women with whom they are engaged in an intimate interpersonal relationship. These intimate relationships are most commonly marked at some point by a special "bond" between partners, as well as cohabitation and sexual involvement. This phenomenon is referred to variously as domestic or family violence, marital violence, conjugal assault, intrafamily violence, spouse abuse, woman abuse, or wife battering. The latter, reduced simply to "battering" is the more common reference used.

Theory, research, treatment, and social action on "battering" has been dominated by a focus on "physical" assault of a woman. Although there is an absence of consensus on a precise operational definition of battering (Rodenburg & Fantuzzo, 1993), appeal is commonly made to the family violence definition of "an act carried out with the intention, or perceived intention, of causing physical pain or injury to another person" (Straus & Gelles, 1986). This violence has been classified in order of severity as "minor" (throw something, shove, grab, or slap), or "serious" (punch, bite, kick, hit with an object, or assault with a weapon). Others, however, have

argued that a broader conceptualization of battering should include physical, property, sexual, economic, and verbal/emotional abuse (Edleson, Eisikovits, & Guttmann, 1985; Martin, 1985, pp. 37-38; Rodenburg & Fantuzzo, 1993; Shepard & Campbell, 1992). This extended definition adds to physical abuse, a category of psychological abuse which may manifest as emotional abuse (disparaging, humiliating remarks), intimidation and threats of harm, social and economic isolation and dependency, and environmental abuse which involve physical displays such as destroying property or belongings (Edleson, Eisikovits, & Guttmann, 1985; Shepard & Campbell, 1992). In psychological abuse, the defining feature remains the intention to do harm.

In the present discussion a break will be made with what appears to be a well entrenched tradition, by referring to the phenomenon of interest as "intimate partner abuse." This phrase is selected because it emphasizes two important features of the phenomenon. First, the term "abuse" is used because it more accurately reflects the continuum of behaviors in which "harm" is inflicted, ranging from psychological aggression to severe physical assault. It is arguable that the term "battering," with its alarming resonance, implies all too strongly severe physical assault, and in doing so masks the equally terrifying and insidious psychological aggression. Although the term "abuse" does not have the same alarming resonance, it more accurately represents the pervasive subtle ambiance of indirect psychological harm in which no aversive physical contact has taken place.

Indeed, use of the term abuse underscores women's reports from my own clinical practice, as well as reports in the literature, which reveal that psychological mistreatment is often experienced by women as much more painful, and slower to heal than physical assault (see Follingstad, Rutledge, Berg, Hause, & Polek, 1990; Thorne-Finch, 1992, p. 13; Woffordt, Mihalic, & Menard, 1994). The more inclusive term "abuse," also acknowledges the concomitant nature of physical and psychological dimensions of abuse (Follingstad, Rutledge, Berg, Hause, & Polek, 1990; Shepard & Campbell, 1992) and that psychological abuse appears to progress to physical abuse (Hyden, 1995; Murphy & O'Leary, 1989).

The second important feature of naming the phenomenon "intimate partner abuse" is that it underscores the fact that the abuse occurs in the context of an interpersonal relationship. That is, that the abuse is directed toward a person with whom the perpetrator may be presumed to have bonded with in at least a rudimentary fashion. This distinguishes it from general abuse in which men or women may inflict harm on another person who functions at arms length. Finally, emphasizing the defining feature of "intimate relationships," reflects growing evidence that the phenomenon of abuse is one of relationships irrespective of gender (Coleman, 1994; Dutton, 1994a; Letellier, 1994; Lochart, White, Causby, & Isaac, 1994; McNeely & Robinson-Simpson, 1987). Hence, specifiers of "wife" or "woman" abuse obscure the critical information of the context in which abuse occurs.

To reiterate, the following discussion and study investigates intimate partner abuse as a phenomenon in which a man inflicts physical or psychological harm on a woman with whom it is presumed that he has had a special intimate bond. Although not explored in the present context, it is assumed that the intimate female partner experiences significant aversive terror in response to the abuse. This is, therefore, a venturing to understand the paradoxical quality of primary intimate adult relationships.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Formal investigation of intimate partner abuse has yielded an unwieldy proliferation of research and theoretical speculation on the origin and nature of men's abuse of their intimate female partners (Dutton, 1988; Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986; Russell, 1988; Tolman & Bennett, 1990). Hamberger (1994) observed that this prolific 25 year history of inquiry has been instrumental in "clarifying and expanding our knowledge" of this phenomenon. Despite the positive tone of this observation, the preponderance of discrepancies in research findings hardly permits formulation of clear and unequivocal conclusions about men's abuse of their female partners. This has prompted modest debate in the published literature, much of which surrounds philosophical and political presuppositions adopted by theorists and researchers, as well as methodological concerns (Berliner, 1990; Bograd, 1990; Gondolf, 1988; Hamberger, 1993; Kurz, 1989; McNeely & Robinson-Simpson, 1987; Pagleow, 1993; Renzetti, 1994).

In a review of the literature on men's abuse of their intimate partners, Russell (1988) classified extant theory and research in terms of sociological and psychological paradigms. Indeed, the bulk of research and theorizing undertaken to date fall into one of these two categories, although the

boundaries between the two are often obscure. Sociological theories propose that intimate partner abuse can be traced to social forces that engender and maintain a "subculture of violence" (Russell, 1988) which condones violence in specific settings. Psychological theories, on the other hand attempt to trace the origins of intimate partner abuse to psychological variables attributed to the men who perpetrate abuse, their female victims, or to both parties in the intimate dyad.

Sociological Models Of Intimate Partner Abuse

Sociological models have been a dominant force in theory, research, and treatment of intimate partner abuse. Once the psychodynamically based hypermasculinity, misogyny, masochistic, and victim precipitant theories went out of favour in the late 1970's (Gondolf, 1985, pp. 29-30), sociological paradigms formed a frequent basis for investigation and intervention. Inspired by the Women's Movement, the Battered Women's Shelter Movement (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986; Martin, 1985), and the outcome of two national surveys in the U.S. (Gelles & Straus, 1988), leading theorists, researchers, and clinicians in domestic violence espoused sociological principles that placed causal factors of this phenomenon in the social and political domain (Gondolf, 1985; Sonkin, Martin, & Walker, 1985; Gelles & Straus, 1988; Walker, 1984).

In essence, the Sociological approach views domestic violence as a "social problem" (Gondolf, 1985, pp. 1-6; Kurz, 1989; Martin, 1985;

Russell, 1988; Stordeur & Stille, 1989, pp. 26-36) in which psychological contributions are viewed as secondary or nonexistent. Rather, the structural organization and mores of society are assumed to be the primary determinants of men's abuse of their intimate partners. Hence, it is the violent subculture of the family and/or the larger culture of violence within which we live that support abuse of women by their male partners. Within the sociological camp, however, a critical division has been made between "family violence" and "feminist" perspectives (Russell, 1988; Kurz, 1989).

The Family Violence Model Of Intimate Partner Abuse

The Family Violence model attributes intimate partner abuse to the discrete violent subculture of the family, which is supported by the conflict prone structure of the family, principles of social exchange, and broader social sanction (Gelles & Straus, 1988, pp. 20-36, 77-97). At the core of this model is the assumption that the structure of the family predisposes it to conflict and "violent exchanges." The emotionally intimate, physically close, and frequent contact between family members differing in gender, age, roles, responsibilities, and power, combined with the inescapable need to make family decisions, is presumed to make conflict inevitable. Moreover, Gelles and Straus argue that within the intimate setting of the family, "it is not easy to choose the flight option" when faced with conflict. "Fighting, then, becomes the main option for resolving intimate conflict" (p. 83). Hence a man's abuse of his female intimate partner is but one

representation of violence that pervades family functioning. It is within this framework that the phenomenon of men's abuse of their intimate female partners acquired labels such as domestic violence, marital violence, spouse abuse, or intrafamily violence, reflecting the contextual component of abuse.

Beyond the characterization of the family as "a pressure cooker containing and escalating stress and conflict" (Gelles & Straus, 1988, pp. 77-97), the Family Violence model also conceives of intimate partner abuse in terms of social exchange of rewards (pp. 20-36). Hence, intimate partner abuse is used because reward accrues to the perpetrator in some fashion. Presumably such rewards might entail persevering on a decision, and/or maintenance of role, responsibility, or power. Equally important is the proposition that punishment does not follow perpetration of abuse; hence, "the costs of violence do not outweigh the rewards" (p. 23). This latter point alludes to the social sanction of violence within the family. Indeed, the characterization of this paradigm as the "violent culture" (Gondolf, 1985, pp. 33-38) perspective underscores the assumption that intimate partner abuse is linked to sociocultural sanction of violence within families.

Gelles and Straus (1988, pp. 20-36) have explicated the role of social sanction in the Family Violence model by proposing that prevailing social attitudes, the private nature of families, and structural inequities in the family maintain conditions where rewards for violence outweigh the costs. Accordingly, broad social approval of violence in conflict resolution,

managing children, and between spouses, accompanied by imbalanced sexist distribution of power within families sets the stage for intimate partner assault. The historical shift from the public to "the private nature of the modern family" is viewed as shielding abusers from negative consequences of violence where they may exist, and makes intimate partner assault distinctly family violence. Moreover, the socially defined structure of the family, which favours men with social, economic, power, and status advantages over women, presumably provides the reinforcement and the resources for men to dominate their female partners violently, as well as the ability to escape the consequences of violence.

Having characterized intimate partner abuse as a domestic issue supported by sociocultural structures, it remains apparent that the Family Violence paradigm is essentially a conflict framework. Indeed, the frequently used measure of intimate partner abuse, the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979), was based upon the conflict theory assumption that "conflict is an inevitable part of all human association." Hence, intimate partner abuse is conceived as a "response to a conflict of interest." Moreover, in the service of resolving inevitable conflict, violence serves as the "ultimate resource" (Carlson, 1984) upon which the perpetrator can draw when other resources prove inadequate. In summary, in the Family Violence perspective, men abuse their intimate partners "because they can" and because there is incentive to do so.

In Defense of the Family Violence Model

Support for the Family Violence viewpoint which makes intimate partner abuse a distinctly family based issue, originated with the observation drawn from two comprehensive national studies conducted in 1975 and 1985 (Gelles & Straus, 1988), that "You are more likely to be physically assaulted, beaten, and killed in your own home at the hands of a loved one than any place else, or by anyone else in our society" (p. 18). The controversial finding in the Gelles and Straus studies that men and women engage in nearly equal frequencies of intimate partner abuse (pp. 250-251) appears to underscore the characterization of intimate partner abuse as a case of domestic conflict. Findings from studies of clinical samples, that both husbands and wives engage in physical aggression and that both experience severe injury, appear to support the mutual combat characterization of intimate partner abuse (Cantos, Neidig, & O'Leary, 1994; Hoffman & Toner, 1988; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Neidig, & Thorn, 1995; Vivian & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1994). Recent findings of comparable levels of intimate partner abuse in gay male and lesbian relationships (see Coleman, 1994; Letellier, 1994; Lockhart, White, Causby, & Isaac, 1994) lends further support for the notion that conflict and violence pervade intimate human relationships, in alternative representation of family. Similarly, the finding that most violent men "specialize" in family or nonfamily victims (Kandel-Englander, 1992), suggests that intimate partner

abuse is a domestic issue, distinct from the effects of a hypothetical universal male predisposition to violence spilling over into the home.

Some of the support for the social sanction, social exchange, and family structure dimensions of the Family Violence model has been drawn from sociological and anthropological observations (Gelles & Straus, 1988, pp. 20-36). Appeal has been made to historical documentation of legal and cultural practices that condone violence within families, as well as throughout society. These include, sometimes ancient, social norms and laws which permit or even encourage violence in the family. For example the English common law "rule of thumb" permitted a husband to beat his wife providing it was done "with a rod no thicker than his thumb." A more severe approval of family violence is found in "stubborn child laws" which once permitted parents to kill unruly children.

In their studies, Gelles and Straus (1988. pp. 20-36) found that both men and women held positive attitudes regarding the use of violence in the family. Gelles and Straus have also noted that violence within families is subtly supported by systemic factors such as police slower response times, as well as lower arrest rates, convictions and penalties, for domestic versus public disturbances. Moreover, attitudes toward problem solving with violence in international conflicts, the predominance of violent cultural heroes publicized in the media, as well as cartoons, comedy, and fairy tales which portray and celebrate violence in the family and society at large, are

presumed to contribute to the manifestation of actual violence within families. Steinmetz (1977-78) draws on similar sociological data to attest to the presence and social approval of women's abuse of their husbands. She provides accounts of legal and community historical documentation of husband battering in Europe and the United States, including post renaissance rituals for treating women who have "beaten" their husbands. Moreover, Steinmetz appeals to comic strip disparaging characterization of men in the domestic role, and assault of men by wives, as evidence of social sanction of abusive treatment in families.

In defense of the hypothesized role of family structure in engendering family violence, Gelles and Straus (1988. pp. 20-36) appeal to anthropological observations that "violence between family members did not occur when families lived in communal residences." Hence, the privatizing of the family - attributed to industrialization, modernization and urbanization, which reduced family size, as well as excluded extended family, servants, and boarders from the home - removed the adult "audience" that might provide a deterrent to unrestrained abuse. Moreover, inequities (between men and women; adults and children) in size, economic resources, and social power, as well as the social/legal legacy in which women have been viewed as men's property and children parental property, presumably provides the systemic incentive and protection for perpetrators of family violence.

Prompted by the Family Violence characterization of intimate partner

abuse as primarily an issue of "conflict" between men and women within the context of the family, many researchers have undertaken to better illuminate the conflictual ambiance of abusive relationships. While the theoretical impetus for much of this particular research may be traced to the sociological foundations of the Family Violence model, it is notable that many of these studies may be viewed as tapping psychological dimensions of the men and women studied. This body of research also forms a more controlled empirical approach to the study of intimate partner abuse than is generally found in strict sociological defense of the Family Violence model.

Controlled studies have observed significantly greater conflict in relationships marked by intimate partner abuse compared to those not identified as abusive (Edleson, Eisikovits, Guttman, & Sela-Amit, 1991; Lloyd, 1990). Others have observed greater reciprocal conflict in abusive relationships where both husbands and wives engage in dysfunctional conflict tactics (Cordova, Jacobson, Gottman, Rushe, & Cox, 1993; Jacobson, Gottman, Waltz, Rushe, Babcock, & Holtzworth-Munroe, 1994; Margolin, John, & Gleberman, 1988; Morrison, Van Hasselt, & Bellack, 1987), and are prone to "negative reciprocity" where one partner's initiation of abuse is met with retaliatory abuse (Cordova, Jacobson, Gottman, Rushe, & Cox, 1993; Jacobson, Gottman, Waltz, Rushe, Babcock, & Holtzworth-Munroe, 1994). Indeed, these negative reciprocity findings led Cordova et al (1993) to question the stereotypical characterization of "battered women"

as submissive and compliant in the face of husband initiated abuse. "Although these women were being beaten, they had not been beaten into submission." Moreover, a study of escalation tendencies found that wives in abusive relationships were more inclined to escalate marital conflict in a curvilinear fashion (intense at first followed by decline in intensity), while support for husband escalation was not found (Margolin, John, & Gleberman, 1988).

Studies of conflict strategies in abusive marriages reveal pervasive aversive responses to conflict. During conflicts, both couples in abusive relationships have been observed to manifest greater anger, verbal aggression, belligerence, and contempt (Lloyd, 1990; Margolin, John, & Gleberman, 1988; Jacobson, Gottman, Waltz, Rushe, Babcock, & Holtzworth-Munroe, 1994). Lloyd (1990) found that abusive couples more often resort to conflict strategies of withdrawal, persist in minor arguments, have stable heated arguments, initiate conflicts more often and more indirectly, and appear to have a stronger investment in solutions. In contrast, these abusive couples less often used negotiation, problem solving or apology during conflicts.

In a study comparing abusive and nonabusive couples, Morrison, Van Hasselt and Bellack (1987), failed to find significant deficits in assertiveness and problem solving ability among abusive couples. Husbands and wives in abusive relationships were, however, distinguished by their tendency to

more often present solutions and compromise when problem solving, their wish to "see change" in their spouse, and their tendency to manifest speech disturbances during conflicts, marked by "pauses, stutters, and expletives such as 'ah,' 'oh,' 'ah' etc," as well as a tendency to less often use praise or provide appreciation. The authors of this study concluded from this cluster of responses that both parties in the abusive relationship suffer "greater social anxiety" than nonabusive couples.

However, in a study focusing just on husband responses in violent and nonviolent dyads, Holtzworth-Munroe and Anglin (1991) concluded that abusive men do have deficient social skill in generating and selecting effective behavioral responses to marital conflict. This deficiency was observed to manifest most strongly in response to specific marital conflicts. Notably, men who initiate intimate partner abuse tend to respond ineffectively in response to perceived rejection and embarrassment by their wives, as well as in jealousy provoking contexts. Conversely, these same men generate more functional responses to wife teasing and requests for something.

Differences in husband and wife responses during conflict in abusive relationships have also been observed. During conflict episodes, compared to nonabusers, abusive husbands have been found to use more "negative voice" (Margolin, John, & Gleberman, 1988), marked by "irate, angry, whining, yelling, sarcastic, nagging, lecturing, accusatory, mocking or

otherwise irritating" vocal expressions; as well as more offending "negative behaviors" such as dismissal gestures, arm waving, finger pointing, threat or mimic gestures, or "negative physical contact." These same abusive men reportedly experience greater "negative affect" such as anxiety, anger, and sadness; the feeling that their wives are attacking them and withholding emotions; as well as increased physiological arousal and pessimism about change in the relationship. In abusive relationships, husbands have also been observed to be more domineering, defensive, controlling, not fearful of their wives, and initiating aggression in response to nonviolent behaviors of their wives, and unlikely to admit they have any problems (Jacobson, Gottman, Waltz, Rushe, Babcock, & Holtzworth-Munroe). In contrast, wife negative reciprocity only occurred in response to husband violence.

The Feminist Model of Intimate Partner Abuse

While maintaining the priority of sociocultural determinants and the significance of the culture of violence, the Feminist Model makes intimate partner abuse a gender-based issue (Bograd, 1990) that conforms to the universal feminist "assumption of the centrality of gender" (Renzetti, 1994) in understanding human behavior. In this model intimate partner abuse is defined specifically as woman abuse, and is conceived as but one of several forms of violent domination of women by men (Stordeur & Stille, 1989, pp. 31-36). At the core of the Feminist model is the assumption that socially constructed patriarchy culturally, politically, legally, and economically

sanctions men's control and subordination of women, and in doing so creates an atmosphere conducive to abuse of women (Birns, Cascardi, & Meyer, 1994; Kurz, 1989; Martin, 1985; Russell, 1988; Smith, 1990; Stordeur & Stille, 1989, pp. 31-36; Yllo, 1984). Indeed, intimate partner abuse represents a "necessary concomitant of the generally oppressed role and position of women" (Alexander, 1993). The etiological focus of the Feminist Paradigm, therefore, shifts more explicitly from the social context of the family to the broader social conditions presumed to be associated with all domination and violent abuse of women by men, and presents the issue of intimate partner abuse as one of "sexual politics, gender domination, and power" (Alexander, 1993).

Central to the Feminist model is the assumption that intimate partner abuse is "a direct result of the power imbalance between men and women" (Birns, Cascardi, & Meyer, 1994), where violence acts as but one of many methods by which men can, and presumably are expected to, dominate and control their female partners. Indeed, in the Feminist Paradigm, "violence against women on the scale that takes place is only possible in a social context that defines women as subordinate to men" (Smith, 1990). Accordingly, it is the patriarchal structure of society that bestows on men "more power and privilege than women," and provides an ideology that legitimizes and supports this imbalance. Thus, "individual men are not only trained and reinforced to be violent against women, but the patriarchal social

structure and men in general are rewarded by women being restricted and limited by their fear of men's violence" (Stordeur & Stille, 1989, p. 32). In this formulation, a specific act of violence against an intimate female partner would not simply reflect the intentions and actions of an individual man or of a couple; rather, it reflects those of a whole society, notably the society of men, maintained through the mechanism of individual masculinity.

In Defense of the Feminist Model

The fundamental gender-based component of the Feminist model of intimate partner abuse is defended foremost by observations that women are the more frequent recipients of severe physical abuse perpetrated by men, compared to that inflicted on men by women (Cantos, Neidig, & O'Leary, 1994; Hamberger & Potente, 1994; Vivian & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1994; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Neidig, & Thorn, 1995). Support for the Feminist characterization of intimate partner abuse as an issue of "sexual politics" and "gender domination" (Alexander, 1990) is also drawn from sociological data regarding social sanction of violence against women, similar to that used by Family Violence proponents. Feminists appeal to a lengthy history of social and legal edicts which gave men permission to dominate and physically assault their wives (Martin, 1985; Thorne-Finch, 1992, pp. 109-112). Such edicts have been traced to early Roman law which permitted husbands to treat their wives as possessions, as well as to assault and even kill noncompliant wives. Such precedent setting sanction of woman abuse

reportedly pervades later legal and social rules throughout Europe and includes the aforementioned English Common Law "rule of thumb." Martin (1985) asserts that the ambiance of inequality, dominance, and abuse of women set by this legal and social history is perpetuated by modern "religious doctrine, by family law, by nonenforcement of criminal law, by an economic system that keeps women dependent upon men, by service providers and therapists who reinforce sex-role stereotyping and maintain the status quo."

Socialization of sex-roles has also been promoted as a critical purveyor of the patriarchal attitudes and social systems that favour men with power over women and effectively sanction men's abuse of their intimate female partners. Birns, Cascardi, and Meyer, (1994) have drawn on research which reveals how socialization effects of parent, teacher, and peer differential responses to male and female children, as well as children's observation of sex-stereotyped marital dyad behaviors and gender roles on television, provide the "underpinnings of men's violence against female partners." In summary, these sex-role socialization practices appear to cultivate male physical aggression, assertiveness, and expectation that action will be reinforced, while females are socialized to be quiet, passive, and embrace positive emotions.

As Smith (1990) has noted, an empirical basis through controlled study for the Feminist Paradigm is somewhat limited. Few explicit tests of

the Feminist hypothesis in intimate partner abuse can be found in professional journals. Smith's own research showed that men's physical abuse of wives had a significant positive correlation with those men's patriarchal beliefs legitimizing "male power and authority over women in marriage," as well as approval of violence against wives who violate patriarchal norms. Smith also found that socioeconomic variables such as lower income, education, and job status correlated with espoused patriarchal attitudes and predicted abuse against their female intimate partners. The finding of a distinct cluster of low-socioeconomic predictors of intimate partner abuse was interpreted by Smith as a testament to the existence of a discrete "patriarchal subculture" maintained by peer socialization.

One of the features of the Feminist Paradigm that has received some attention by quantitative researchers, albeit not always clearly grounded in Feminist theory or distinguished from Family Violence theory, is the role of power in intimate partner abuse. For example, Petrik, Petrik Olson, and Subotnik (1994) have studied power and control experiences in couples with an abusive husband. Men who had abused their intimate female partners were found to "feel powerless, have a low tolerance for being controlled, and have a consequent need to control." The abused wives also felt powerless, but could tolerate a modest amount of being controlled. In a similar vein, Dutton and Strachan (1987) found that wife assaulters possessed significantly greater "need for power" than two nonassaultive

husband groups combined; although they did not differ from maritally conflicted nonassaultive men. Dutton and Strachan also found that wife assaulters demonstrated significantly less verbal assertiveness than the control groups. "The resulting profile is of men who have strong needs to control or have impact on their wives but who do not have the verbal means to satisfy their needs." It is perhaps notable that these researchers attempt to explain their findings by appealing to Fromm's notion of sadism where the pursuit of control over another operates as "a social power substitute for an inner sense of emptiness and powerlessness."

A study of the role of marital power imbalance in intimate partner abuse has also been undertaken using specific power variables (Babcock, Waltz, Jacobson, & Gottman, 1993) such as "power bases" (i.e. socioeconomic status), "power processes" (ie. communication resources), and "power outcomes" (i.e decision making power). The results of this study provide additional evidence of a significant correlation between men's sense of powerlessness and intimate partner abuse, which may be construed as supporting the Feminist contention that abuse is a reaction to unfulfilled patriarchal advantage. It remains, however, that this relationship appears to be dominated by husband deficiencies in power outcomes such as "decision making" power. The role of power base, specifically wife dominant economic power, was not correlated with husband initiated abuse; however, wife education advantage did correlate with husband's perception of

deficient decision making power. An additional observation of this study was that men who abused their wives manifested diminished communication skill, and that a relational pattern of "husband demand/wife withdraw" marked relationships in which men abused their partners. The authors of this study note, however, these abusive relationships are also marked by both partners engaging in the demand/withdraw pattern, which sets the stage for much conflict and power struggle. It is of note as well, that the demand/withdraw pattern is interpreted to illustrate power differential. The one who is able to withdraw is assumed to have the greater power. In summary, these researchers conclude that "husbands' and wives' poor communication skill, husbands' low decision making power, and increased husband demand/wife withdraw patterns were all associated with husbands' greater violence toward wives."

The power dimension has also been studied within the Feminist assumption that men would abuse their intimate female partners when the power advantage ostensibly provided by the patriarchy is challenged within the relationship. Claes and Rosenthal (1990) found that overall power of female partners (combined leadership, coercion, and reward power) did not correlate significantly with men's intimate partner abuse; however, one discrete power dimension, "reward power" produced a positive correlation with severe violence. However, these researchers also found that "the best predictor of severity of violence was couple difference in educational level."

Hence, wives with greater reward power and lower level of education than their partners would be expected to experience greater husband violence. These researchers speculate that the effect of reward power on intimate partner abuse is a testament to the "dependency conflicts'" these men have with their partners who may provide "primary personal support." Their findings could also be construed as support for the social exchange feature of both Family Violence and Feminist paradigms; however, it is prudent to recall the previously cited contrasting finding of disconfirmation of negative reinforcement in intimate partner abuse (Cordova, Jacobson, Gottman, Rushe, & Cox, 1993).

Further elaboration of the role of power imbalance and social context in intimate partner abuse is found in Yllo's (1984) study of marital inequality and wife-beating. The specific focus of this study on "decision-making power" provides a preliminary test of the Feminist assumption that imbalances in the distribution of power within the marital dyad that favour the husband provide a basis for men's abuse of the intimate female partners. The essential finding of this study was that equally shared decision-making power results in the lowest frequency of abused wives (3%), while unequal distribution of decision-making power resulted in higher frequencies of abuse. It is notable that the significantly higher rate of abuse of wives in inequitable power relationships, occurs for both wife dominant (7.1%) and husband dominant (10.7%) dyads. Hence, at the interpersonal level, where

there is imbalanced distribution of power in the relationship there is more abuse than when there is an equitable distribution. The researchers in this study also tested the effect of "structural context" in intimate partner abuse. They found that husband dominant relationships produced more severe violence against wives in those American states in which women held greater status, measured on economic, educational, political, and legal dimensions. Overall, this appears to support the Feminist notion that issues of power are instrumental in producing intimate partner abuse by men, and that "the violent interactions that take place in the privacy of the home do appear to be influenced by social structural factors."

In a similar vein, Colman and Straus (1986) studied the effects of marital decision-making power, as well as consensus on the distribution of that power, on conflict and abuse in intimate personal relationships. The findings of this study reveal an interesting relationship between distribution of power, consensus over that distribution, marital conflict, and violence. At the outset, it was observed that male-dominant relationships and female-dominated relationships experienced respectively higher conflict than "divided power" and "equalitarian" relationships. The latter manifested the highest consensus over distribution of power and the lowest conflict. Male-dominated relationships demonstrated the lowest consensus in power distribution. It was also observed that the greater the marital conflict, the greater the increase in violence. Hence, the researchers conclude that there

is a relationship between power structure and violence, although consensus over the distribution of power can diminish the level of conflict that precedes violence.

CHAPTER THREE

The Psychological Paradigm In Intimate Partner Abuse

The Psychological Paradigm turns to intrapsychic forces in the people involved to seek understanding of intimate partner abuse (Russell, 1988). Although the boundaries between Psychological and Sociological paradigms blur at times, the Psychological approach focuses more on the person as a unit of analysis and less on contextual/social forces. While there is an extensive body of literature on the psychological variables associated with women who have been abused, the present review will focus primarily on those variables pertinent to men who perpetrate abuse. Moreover, the long since abandoned Psychoanalytic victim precipitant approaches will not be reviewed here. As a rule, the Psychological Paradigm does not appear to have the comprehensive and explicit theoretical frameworks found in the Sociological models. Indeed, with a few exceptions, Psychological models are not very explicit. Rather, what exists is a body of research findings that in the aggregate point toward important psychological dimensions that appear to contribute to intimate partner abuse.

Within the morass of psychological variables studied, the Psychological Paradigm can be represented by three categories: Intergenerational Transmission, Personality Variables, and Interpersonal Attachment. In Intergenerational Transmission theory, children who witnessed or experienced abuse in the family of origin are presumed to learn

abusive behavior in that context, and practice it in intimate relationships as adults. The Personality approach identifies characterological dimensions of men who abuse their intimate partners, suggesting that something in their psychic makeup predisposes them to abuse their intimate partners. Interpersonal Attachment approaches focus on the role that men's attachment and individuation capacity in intimate relationships contributes to abuse in those relationships.

Intergenerational Transmission Theory of Intimate Partner Abuse

Of all the Psychological approaches to intimate partner abuse, Intergenerational Transmission is perhaps the one most explicitly articulated as a theory, and is certainly a highly studied and discussed phenomenon. Indeed, Intergenerational Transmission and its attendant theory Social Learning are commonly cited as mediating forces in Family Violence and Feminist viewpoints (see Martin, 1985). Thus, Intergenerational Transmission represents an initial shifting of the problem of intimate partner abuse to what is arguably the heart of the matter: The psychology of persons. Moreover, it represents a tacit acknowledgement that transmission of the effects of social forces requires psychological internalization in persons.

Intergenerational Transmission theory maintains that exposure to abuse in one generation will increase the probability of abuse in later generations (Doumas, Margolin, & John, 1994). The origins of the concept

of Intergenerational Transmission have been traced by Widom (1989) to the brief musings of Curtis in a 1963 publication. Since that time it has become "common wisdom" (Cappell & Heiner, 1990) that experienced or witnessed violence in the family of origin will transfer to the adult family. Lewis (1987) called the observation that both abused wives and abusive husbands were abused as children, the "most agreed upon finding in family violence research."

Arguably the assertion that exposure to family of origin abuse in and of itself provides an inadequate explanation of intimate partner abuse. Rather, an explanation of "how" the effect takes place is necessary. Typically accounts of Intergenerational Transmission appeal to the concept of Social Learning for such an explanation (Doumas, Margolin, & John, 1994; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Neidig, & Thorn, 1995; MacEwen, 1994; MacEwen & Barling, 1988; Widom, 1989). Social Learning theory proposes that abusive behavior is learned by observing an influential model perpetrate abuse and imitating the model's behavior (see Bandura, 1973). Hence, children observe adult abusive behavior in the family of origin, learn that it is acceptable behavior in the family environment, and repeat the pattern as adults themselves.

Research on Intergenerational Transmission

Typically, reviews of the Intergenerational Transmission hypothesis have concluded that evidence that exposure to family of origin violence

predicts intimate partner abuse is equivocal at best (Cappell & Heiner, 1990; Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986; Hotaling & Sugarman, 1990; MacEwen, 1994; Widom, 1989). In one review of research on the effects of Intergenerational Transmission on a range of aggressive behaviors, Widom (1989) concluded that evidence supporting the notion that "abuse leads to abuse is fairly sparse." Widom did, however, observe a "weak" association between childhood experience and witnessing of family violence and perpetrating marital aggression as an adult. Perhaps more importantly, this review revealed that childhood neglect and rejection predicted greater aggression than being abused as a child. In a later study, however, Rivera and Widom (1990) observed that both childhood abuse and neglect were predictors of later violent offending.

Using large sample survey data from men and women, Cappell and Heiner (1990) also found only limited support for the notion that experiencing or witnessing family of origin aggression would predict adult intimate partner abuse. They did find, however, that childhood witnessing of parental violence predisposed both males and females to become victims of adult intimate partner abuse. This prompted the conclusion that men and women "do not learn to behave aggressively toward their spouse in their family of origin;" rather, they learn "vulnerability." Cappell and Heiner also made the noteworthy finding that compared to girls, boys appear to be the more frequent recipients of physical assault from parents, and that mothers

more frequently perpetrated this abuse.

Similar results emerged in a study of abusive military couples, revealing only limited support for Intergenerational Transmission (Langhrichsen-Rohling, Neidig, & Thron, 1995). In this study no relationship was found between childhood witnessed marital aggression, while experienced aggression was only "slightly but significantly correlated with" men's perpetration of current intimate partner abuse. Hence, the authors of this study conclude that "neither witnessing nor experiencing parental aggression is necessary for engaging in subsequent marital aggression. It is notable that in this study the Cappell and Heiner (1990) finding of Intergenerational Transmission of vulnerability to victimization for both men and women was replicated. Moreover, Langhrichsen-Rohling, Neidig, & Thron (1995) found that childhood victimization by "mothers significantly predicted marital perpetration" when it did occur for both men and women.

In a longitudinal study of multiple stressors impinging on abusive relationships, MacEwen and Barling (1988) failed to find support for Intergenerational Transmission effects on intimate partner abuse. In contrast, Smith and Williams (1992) found that adolescents from abusive homes engaged in more dating violence than those from nonabusive homes. It is notable, however, that less than 20% of those from abusive homes committed date violence, in effect providing little support for Intergenerational Transmission of violence within that group.

Some studies of intimate partner abuse have observed Intergenerational Transmission effects. Using data provided by abused women Lewis (1987) found that both men who abused their wives, and women who have been abused by their husbands had been victims of childhood physical abuse. Data drawn from self-reports of men who had abused their wives also revealed that experienced and witnessed family violence in childhood correlated significantly with adult abuse of a spouse (Barnett, Fagan & Booker, 1991). The latter study also revealed that the most abusive men had been exposed to the "highest levels of physical and psychological abuse from both parents." Finally, a longitudinal study of intergenerational Transmission effects on intimate partner abuse and child abuse, revealed that exposure to family of origin aggression "is predictive of aggression across three generations for males" (Doumas, Margolin, & John, 1994); however, this finding did not hold for females.

Evidence is also available that Intergenerational Effects may be more complicated than a simple linear passing of learned abuse from generation to generation. Using men's self-reports, Caesar (1988) found confirmation of Intergenerational Transmission effects for men. Of particular importance, were the perceptions of and meanings attached to family of origin violence. As children, abusive men tended to become enmeshed in the parental conflict as a mediator attempting to end the dispute. They also reportedly aligned themselves with one parent who they idealized and attempted to

protect. In contrast, nonabusive men who witnessed family of origin violence disengaged from the marital strife and "seemed better able to individuate later on in their lives." It was also observed that both abusive and nonabusive men had experienced equal frequency of parental discipline; however, significantly more abusive men experienced severe discipline procedures using "a switch, belt, or other object." Moreover, abusive men not exposed to family of origin effects were more likely (62%) to have received severe discipline suggesting an alternate Intergenerational Transmission of abusive predisposition. Finally, it is noteworthy that in contrast to the findings of Cappell and Heiner (1990) and of Langhrichsen-Rohling, Neidig, & Thron (1995) in which mothers were more frequently the perpetrators of childhood abuse, Caesar (1988) found that fathers and mothers were equally likely to abuse children.

The complexity of possible Intergenerational effects is also reflected in a study by MacEwen (1994) that more directly addresses Social Learning effects in the passing of abuse between generations. MacEwen reminds us that Social Learning theory does not imply that it is sufficient simply to observe a model and imitate the behavior. Rather, there are "conditions" which facilitate or undermine the learning of observed behavior (see Grant & Evans, 1994, pp. 297-302). In the MacEwen (1994) study Intergenerational Transmission effects were observed, with experienced and witnessed abuse exerting cumulative effects on current intimate partner abuse. "Impact" of

family of origin abuse also reportedly compounded the effect of exposure to family aggression. When frequent and severe abuse was experienced in the family of origin, impact in the form of serious consequences for the family added significantly to the prediction of current abuse. Similarly, it was found that when family of origin abuse is high, "identification" with the abuser enhances prediction of second generation abuse. MacEwen concluded, therefore, that the risk of Intergenerational Transmission established by high family of origin abuse can be reduced when the impact of that abuse on the family is low and when identification with the abusing parent is low. It is significant to note that MacEwen found no support for the expectation that male models would be more influential than female models in perpetuating aggression. Both mother and father abuse predicted adult abusive tendencies for both women and men.

Personality-Typology Approach

The Personality-Typology approach to intimate partner abuse draws the focus of study most explicitly and directly to the level of persons, with comparatively less consideration of contextual factors. With this approach Personality Profiles or Typologies are typically constructed of men who perpetrate intimate partner abuse. Although Personality Profiles and Typologies often overlap, there appears to be a basis for discriminating between the two. A Personality Profile more explicitly articulates personality characteristics that dominate the presentation of men who abuse their

intimate partners. Typologies, on the other hand focus more on behavioral traits (Gondolf, 1988b), and may include demographic, family of origin and socioeconomic variables. In view of the fact that some Typologies include specific reference to personality dimensions and/or imply underlying personality, the distinction between personality organization and typology may be an artificial one.

As noted previously, the Personality-Typology Approach above all others is perhaps the most atheoretical. Certainly, few of the discussions to be reviewed presently articulate an explicit theory. Rather, they tend to be descriptive, and/or make rudimentary predictions of personality organization or typology. It may be inferred, however, that an implicit theory does pervade the Personality Profile formulation, although not necessarily Typologies. This implicit Personality Theory would predict that personality organization predisposes men to perpetrate intimate partner abuse. More specifically, the presence of an aggregate of certain personality dimensions would predispose men to manifest experiences, perceptions, emotions, cognitions, behaviors, etc., that would either be abusive in themselves or promote abuse in intimate relationships.

Research on Personality and Typology

Investigation of personality and typology forms a large body of published research on men who perpetrate intimate partner abuse. Three initial conclusions emerge from this literature. First, men who abuse their

intimate partners do appear to manifest different personality characteristics than nonabusive men (Barnett & Hamberger, 1992; Dewhurst, Moore, & Alfano, 1992; Goldstein & Rosenbaum, 1985; Murphy, Meyer, & O'Leary, 1993). Second, men who abuse their intimate partners form a heterogeneous population in which no single profile adequately represents all men who have been abusive toward their intimate partner (Bersani, Chen, Pendleton, & Denton, 1992; Cadsky & Crawford, 1988; Gondolf, 1988; Greene & Johnson, 1994; Hamberger & Hastings, 1986; Hamberger & Hastings, 1991; Hart, Dutton, & Newlove, 1993; Hastings & Hamberger, 1988; Hershorn & Rosenbaum, 1991; Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994; Saunders, 1992; Shields, McCall & Hanneke, 1988). A third conclusion is that men who abuse their intimate partners more often manifest pathological or disordered personality organization (Barnett & Hamberger, 1992; Cadsky & Crawford, 1988; Dewhurst, Moore, & Alfano, 1992; Flournoy & Wilson, 1991; Greene & Johnson, 1994; Hamberger & Hastings, 1986; Hamberger & Hastings, 1991; Hart, Dutton, & Newlove, 1993; Hastings & Hamberger, 1988; Murphy, Meyer, & O'leary, 1993).

Typology Research

Typology studies reveal some continuities and discontinuities in classification of men who abuse their intimate partners. Several researchers have compared men who restrict their assaultive behavior to intimate partners, and those who assault both intimate partners and other persons

(Cadsky & Crawford, 1988; Gondolf, 1988b; Hershorn & Rosenbaum, 1991; Saunders, 1992; Shields, McCall, & Hanneke, 1988). In the aggregate, it has been observed that the former, "Family-only" abusers, tended to perpetrate less frequent and less severe abuse than the latter, "Generally" abusive men. An exception to this trend is found in the Hershorn and Rosenbaum (1991) observation that Family-only abusers perpetrated more severe abuse on their intimate partners, while Generally abusive men engaged in more frequent but less severe violence, mostly against persons outside the intimate dyad. Overall, compared to Generally abusive men, Family-only abusers tended to be better adjusted, older, legally married, law abiding, apologetic and less defensive about their abusive behavior, as well as having greater marital satisfaction and commitment, self-esteem and occupational status. Family-only abusive men also manifested lower levels of assertiveness, anger, depression, and jealousy that appears to belie suppression of feelings (Saunders, 1992). Indeed, Family-only abusers reportedly have difficulty acknowledging or expressing anger, let anger accumulate and then explosively release it (Hershorn & Rosenbaum, 1991). Finally, Family-only abusers more often than Generally abusive men avoid and experience less marital conflict, as well as demonstrate higher social desirability tendencies and liberal sex role attitudes (Saunders, 1992).

In contrast, Generally abusive men have been found to inflict more frequent and severe abuse on current and previous intimate partners (Cadsky

& Crawford, 1988; Gondolf, 1988b; Saunders, 1992; Shields, McCall, & Hanneke, 1988), with the exception of the Hershorn and Rosenbaum (1991) finding that Generally abusive men perpetrated less severe violence than Family-only abusers. Generally abusive men also manifested lower self-esteem and internal control, greater defensiveness regarding their abuse, rigid sex role attitudes, higher alcohol abuse associated with their violence, as well as low to moderate depression and anger. Moreover, Generally abusive men have been observed to have pervasive shallow and diminished affective expression marked by modest conscious expression of negative emotions, which Saunders (1992) speculates reflects "affective numbing" and detachment from feelings. Finally, Generally abusive men also have histories of early delinquency and childhood antisocial behaviors, more arrests and criminal convictions, unstable and short relationships, family of origin criminality (Cadsky & Crawford, 1988), as well as ineffective or minimal childhood discipline (Hershorn & Rosenbaum, 1991).

Differences in Intergenerational Transmission effects are also evident between Family-only and Generally abusive men. Family-only abusers were found to have been exposed to less family of origin violence, while Generally abusive men had witnessed more parental violence and experienced more severe child abuse (Hershorn & Rosenbaum, 1991; Saunders, 1992). In keeping with the previously discussed complexity of Intergenerational Transmission effects, one study observed Family-only abusive men to have

experienced greater childhood maternal rejection, as well as severe discipline from both parents than Generally abusive men (Hershorn & Rosenbaum, 1991). In another study no significant difference in exposure to family of origin violence was found, although Generally abusive men did witness higher parental violence (Cadsky & Crawford, 1988). Family-only abusive men have also been reported to have experienced more severe physical abuse from fathers (Shields, McCall, & Hanneke, 1988).

Several typology researchers have also identified a third cluster of abusers to be added to the Family-only and Generally abusive clusters. Gondolf (1988b) identified a category, which he labeled "Antisocial" that fell between his "Typical" (Family-only) and "Sociopathic" (Generally) abusive clusters, which perpetrated severe abuse in and outside of intimate relationships, but were distinguished by their relatively low criminal activity. Saunders (1992) also identified a mid range category of "emotionally volatile" abusers characterized by less severe and less generalized abuse than Generally abusive men; however they were "the most psychologically abusive" and maritally dissatisfied of all three categories. This group reportedly expressed more rigid sex role attitudes, were less likely to have experienced child abuse, and were more often depressed, suicidal, angry, and fearful of abandonment by their partners than Generally abusive men.

In a review and theory formulation of typology, Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) articulate a three subtype formulation reflecting the above

review, which provides a useful summary of typology. They propose a "Family-only" type that would engage in the least severe abuse, restricted to intimate partners, and who would either have no personality disorder, or a passive-dependent personality. The "Dysphoric/Borderline" typology would engage in moderate to severe abuse that would include psychological and sexual abuse, limited primarily to intimate partners but also extending to some others, and engaging in some criminal behaviors. Dysphoric/Borderline abusers would also be expected to experience significant psychological distress and depression, be emotionally volatile, manifest borderline and schizoidal personality features, and modest substance abuse tendencies. Finally, the "Generally Violent/Antisocial" abusers would perpetrate moderate to severe abuse that would include psychological and sexual abuse, the most nonintimate partner abuse, as well as extensive criminal activity, substance abuse, and antisocial personality disorder traits.

Personality Research

The general consensus of research directly assessing personality characteristics is that men who abuse their intimate partners consistently manifest personality disorders and psychopathology. Indeed, Flournoy & Wilson (1991) have observed that "personality disorders constitute the most common diagnostic picture of batterers." This picture is, however, a complicated one. Men who abuse their intimate partners have met the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory (Millon, 1983) criteria for Schizoidal,

Borderline, Narcissistic, Antisocial, Passive Dependent, and Compulsive personality disorders (Greene, Coles, & Johnson, 1994; Hamberger & Hastings, 1986; Hamberger & Hastings, 1991; Hastings & Hamberger, 1988). In another study, the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory - Second Edition (Millon, 1987) criteria were met for 14 of the 22 clinical scales, nine of which correspond to the DSM-III-R (American Psychiatric Association, 1987) diagnoses of Sadistic, Antisocial, Passive-Aggressive, Paranoid, Narcissistic, Borderline, Self-Defeating, Avoidant, and Schizotypal personality disorders (Murphy, Meyer, & O'Leary, 1993). In that study DSM-III-R Axis I diagnoses of psychopathology were made of Bipolar, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Dependence, Thought Disorder, and Major Depression. Similarly with the use of the MCMI-II and the Personality Disorder Examination (Loranger, 1988), Hart, Dutton, and Newlove (1993) observed that 80% to 90% of abusive men met the criteria for DSM-III-R personality disorders, most frequently those of Sadistic, Antisocial, and Borderline personality disorders. Finally, Barnett & Hamberger (1992) observed that men who abused their intimate partners scored significantly lower on 10 of 18 subscales on a nonpathological measure of personality, the California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1975). This finding further suggests that these men do not possess traits that conform to normal personality organization.

The preponderance of observed psychopathology and personality

disorder evident in this research provides adequate evidence for the conclusion that men who abuse their intimate partners are not psychologically well adjusted (Barnett & Hamberger, 1992). Indeed, in the aggregate this body of research cites personality dysfunction in abusive men reminiscent of virtually all of the possible personality disorders from the DSM-III-R (American Psychiatric Association, 1987). It remains necessary, however, to articulate the phenomenology of these disorders to fully understand their implications for abusive behavior. Based on the personality dysfunction identified in this research, the personality disorders from the DSM-III-R "cluster B" are most evident. Personality disorders from this cluster are characterized by "dramatic, emotional, or erratic" behaviors, and include Antisocial, Borderline, Histrionic, and Narcissistic personality disorders.

Most commonly cited in personality research on men who abuse their intimate partners, are Antisocial and Borderline personality disorders. These two disorders are marked by shared characteristics of impulsivity, labile affect, attention seeking, and irritable stubbornness (American Psychiatric Association, 1987; Othmer & Othmer, 1994, pp. 403-452). Antisocial Personality is distinguished by the tendency to be emotionally cold, self-centered, exploitive, dishonest, and involved in criminal activity. Borderline Personality is distinguished by the presence of disturbed identity, exaggerated emotionality, boredom, suicidal impulses, and a tendency

toward unstable yet dependent relationships. Other characteristics from cluster B drawn from Narcissistic and Histrionic tendencies include hypersensitivity to criticism and praise, as well as grandiose, ungenuine, and self-serving behavior. In summary, within the parameters of cluster B, men who abuse their intimate partners would be described as possessing some features of "irresponsible and antisocial behavior" (Antisocial Personality); unstable identity, relationships, and mood (Borderline Personality); excessively emotional and attention-seeking (Histrionic Personality); and/or concerned with self-importance, unempathic, and hypersensitive to evaluation of self (Narcissistic Personality).

Evidence of other personality disorders suggest that men who abuse their intimate partners may also manifest "odd or eccentric" (American Psychiatric Association, 1987) behavior, marked by: relationship indifference, restricted affective experience and expression (Schizoid Personality); "peculiarities of ideation, appearance, and behavior," as well as poor skills in interpersonal relationships (Schizotypal Personality); and/or a predisposition to misinterpret behaviors of others as deliberately threatening (Paranoid Personality). Other personality research findings would suggest that some men who abuse their intimate partners would present as highly anxious, accompanied by: shyness, social discomfort and fear of negative evaluation (Avoidant Personality); inflexible and perfectionistic (Obsessive Compulsive Personality); indirectly resistant to demands for social

performance (Passive Aggressive); prone to "cruel, demeaning, and aggressive behavior" (Sadistic Personality); and/or tending to "avoid or undermine pleasurable experiences" (Self-defeating Personality).

In the literature, several attempts have been made to synthesize the dimensions and phenomenology of personality disorder organization amongst men who abused their intimate partners. Barnett and Hamberger (1992) concluded from their study of personality that men who abuse their intimate partners manifest a "criminal personality" with difficulties in three areas, all of which become more problematic under stress: "intimacy, impulsivity, and problem solving." Perhaps of foremost importance is that men who abused their intimate partners were found to have "difficulty with developing close, intimate relationships based on mutuality," and are anxious, defensive, and distrusting in those relationships. Indeed, difficulties with intimate and social relationships pervades the personality disorders discussed above. Impulsivity in the Barnett and Hamberger report is accompanied by discontrol of affect. Impulsivity was also found to be a significant characteristic of abusive men by Flournoy & Wilson (1991), accompanied by a tendency to minimize the outcome or externalize blame for impulsive actions. Barnett and Hamberger (1992) characterized problem solving ability of their abusive men as marked by "rigid, stereotyped, and unresourceful" behaviors. Maiuro, Cahn, and Vitaliano (1986) elaborate on this "social skill deficiency" in their observation that abusive men manifest adequate "refusal

assertiveness" but lower "aggressive assertiveness" that involves "positive" seeking of needs in social interaction. It is perhaps notable that difficulties with impulsivity, moodiness, and rigid stereotyped problem solving were found to correlate with family of origin physical and psychological abuse of these men in the Barnett and Hamberger (1992) study.

Perhaps most useful in simplifying the dimensions and phenomenology of personality disorder in men who have abused their intimate partners are the factor analytical findings of Hamberger and Hastings (1986), which reveal three "discrete types" of personality organization among men who abuse their intimate partners. The first "Schizoidal/Borderline" cluster is most like the DSM-III-R Borderline Personality and is characterized by a tendency toward social isolation, internal conflict and tension, high levels of depression and anger, predisposition to alcohol abuse, and hypersensitivity and over-reaction to interpersonal slights. This personality organization is also commonly identified as the "Jeckyl and Hyde" person whose mood vacillates unpredictably and suddenly from calm and controlled to intense anger and aggression. Through all this, the Schizoidal/Borderline abuser struggles with a "sense of defeat and helplessness" in his inability to obtain resolution of his personal and interpersonal problems. Not surprisingly, this type of personality would predispose them to significant emotion-laden conflict in intimate relationships.

The second personality disorder cluster identified by Hamberger and

Hastings (1986) was labeled "Narcissistic/Antisocial." Men in this cluster manifest low levels of depression and anger, are highly energetic, and are only marginally at risk for substance abuse. On the down side, these men are extremely self-centred, exploitive and manipulative of others, attempt to impose their views and values on others, and demand treatment from others in accordance with their own standards, which when not received incites aggression. The third, "Passive Dependent/Compulsive," cluster describes men with "extremely low" energy, who are prone to moderate levels of depression, low levels of anger, and modest aggressiveness. These "tense" and "rigid" men tend to have low self-esteem, and behave in "a weak passive, or ingratiating way." They experience a strong "need" for one or a few intimate relationship(s); however, when such "need" is not being met "hostile feelings" may be provoked.

Severity of anger expression and MMPI characteristics have been correlated with these factor clusters (Greene, Cole, & Johnson, 1994). Narcissistic/Antisocial personalities were found to express the least amount of anger, as well as high MMPI scores on Hysteria and psychopathic deviate scales. Dependent/Compulsive men expressed "slightly more" anger and elevated scores on MMPI depression and psychopathic deviate scales. Schizoidal/Borderline men manifest the greatest and most uncontrolled anger, as well as MMPI elevations in hypochondriasis, depression, psychopathic deviate, paranoia, psychasthenia, schizophrenia, hypomania,

and social introversion scales. This study also revealed that men who have abused their intimate partners are more likely than nonabusive men to experience "depression, antisocial attitudes, distrust, anxiety, and other psychopathology."

Investigation of personality organization of men who have abused their intimate partners has also been undertaken using an assessment instrument purportedly able to measure personality features that would contribute to dysfunctional intimate relationships (Bersani, Chen, Pendleton, & Denton, 1992). In this study, factor analysis produced a two factor solution evidently tapping internal versus social features of personality. The first factor, "Internal/Emotional Balance" produced a profile of men who manifested internal conflict over "unresolved" problems, marked by nervousness and depression, as well as inability to experience cognitive or affective empathy, external anger expression, and impulsive tendencies. The second factor, "Social Interaction" contained "social attributes which are acceptable (even rewarded) in our society." Notably, this cluster characterized abusive men as outgoing extroverts who found social interaction compelling. In the aggregate, however, these two factor were judged to reflect men who although highly sociable, due to internal conflict and emotional imbalance, would not be able to undertake "positive social interaction." Rather, men with this profile would be expected to reveal "a restless proclivity for interaction that will be competitive and conflict-

oriented." As the authors of this study note, this extroverted characterization is contrary to the customary view of abusive men as introverted and isolated.

A final theme in this body of literature provides additional clarity to the phenomenology of personality features of men who abuse their intimate partners, as well as a more concrete theoretical formulation than is commonly found in personality literature. Dutton and Starzomski (1993) and Dutton (1994b) have investigated the role of Borderline Personality Organization in intimate partner abuse, which is considered a less severe pathology than Borderline Personality Disorder. Borderline Personality Organization characteristics "(in order of importance) are: (a) a proclivity for intense, unstable interpersonal relationships characterized by intermittent undermining of the significant other, manipulation, and masked dependency; (b) an unstable sense of self with intolerance of being alone and abandonment anxiety; and (c) intense anger, demandingness, and impulsivity, usually tied to substance abuse or promiscuity" (Dutton, 1994b; Dutton & Starzomski, 1993).

This personality cluster is considered to manifest most saliently in intimate relationships, and is accompanied by a three stage "defense structure" marked by sudden transitions in experience, affect, and behavior (Dutton, 1994b; Dutton & Starzomski, 1993). The first stage of "dysphoric stalemate" is invoked when "intimacy needs" are unfulfilled, and the man

lacks the personal resources to "assert those needs" (see Maiuro, Cahn, & Vitaliano, 1986, for a discussion of assertiveness of abusive men's needs). The second stage is marked by a perception of impending loss of the relationship, while the third stage involves behaviors designed to avoid the experience of aloneness.

Commentary by Dutton (1994b) and Dutton & Starzomski (1993) on The Self-Report Instrument for Borderline Personality Organization (Oldham, et al, 1985) provides further insight into the features of this phenomenon. This instrument reportedly measures "identity diffusion" which is reflected in "a poorly integrated sense of self or of significant others," and may be evidenced in "chronic emptiness, or in contradictory perceptions of the self, contradictory behavior that cannot be integrated in an emotionally meaningful way, and impoverished perceptions of other." This instrument also reportedly measures "primitive defenses" that operate by dissociating incongruous experiences, and which include "splitting, idealization, devaluation, omnipotence, denial, projection, and projective identification." Finally, in keeping with the assumption that men with Borderline Personality Organization "have transient psychotic episodes," a reality testing subscale is included. Hence, this theory would predict that men who abuse their intimate partners who possess Borderline Personality Organization, would possess "fragile selfhood" plagued by the experience of impending disintegration of self that is accompanied by psychotic splits, and the

impulse to undertake actions to defend against this experience of disintegration.

Both Dutton & Starzomski (1993) and Dutton (1994b) found significant relationships between Borderline Personality Organization men's psychological/verbal and physical abuse of their intimate female partners, as well as anger, jealousy, domination, and isolation behaviors. It is of note that Dutton (1994b) cites estimates of 11-15% Borderline Personality Organization in the general population, which appears to parallel incidence rates of intimate partner abuse. Reporting on his own previous research, Dutton observed that in keeping with predictions Borderline Personality Organization, men who have abused their intimate partner, when exposed to the threat of wive's "greater independence and emotional distance" manifest significantly more anger than nonabusive men. This anticipation of loss response was termed "abandonment panic." Dutton also notes that men with low Borderline Personality Organization still engaged in abusive behaviors, albeit with less frequency; however, men with high Borderline Personality Organization were "more angered and more assaultive in response to intimacy issues and may be angered by the very experience of intimacy."

In both reports (Dutton, 1994b; Dutton & Starzomski, 1993), the question is posed of why men experience such anger in intimate relationships? The answer provided is that it lies in the "meaning" attributed

to intimacy. In the Borderline Personality Organization, "intimate relationships serve the unenviable task" of supporting the integrity of self. Hence the relationship and the intimate partner are "asked to do the impossible" which is to prevent disintegration of the self. In view of the man's inability to tolerate aloneness, his unstable self, and his inability to assertively seek fulfillment of his needs, chronic threats of disintegration of self coupled with defensive projection, will inevitably result in anger. Dutton notes that this chronic "intimacy anxiety" and dependence on another to maintain "selfhood" attests to fundamental psychological powerlessness in men who abuse their intimate partners "that many males may mask with the trappings of sociopolitical power."

Interpersonal Attachment Approach

The final, psychological domain to be reviewed in the present discussion focuses on the defining feature of "relational intimacy" in intimate partner abuse. This aspect of intimate partner abuse underscores the fact that we are investigating a phenomenon that is fundamentally distinguished by relationship between persons. That is, intimate partner abuse is ultimately about abuse toward someone with whom the abuser is presumed to have at some time experienced intense affective attachment. Hence, it is appropriate that investigators of this phenomenon would explore the role of relational attachment dynamics in perpetrating intimate partner abuse.

At the core of the Attachment approach is the assertion that a man's

intimate partner abuse is "a form of protest behavior directed at his attachment figure . . . precipitated by perceived threats of separation or abandonment" (Dutton, Saunders, Starzomski, & Bartholomew, 1994). This is founded on Bowlby's (1969, 1973, 1980, 1988) Attachment Theory regarding the human propensity to form intense emotional bonds, and the observation that some "of the most intense emotions arise during the formation, the maintenance, the disruption and the renewal of attachment relationships" (Bowlby, 1980, pp. 38-43). Of this bonding process Bowlby contends that: "If it goes well, there is joy and a sense of security. If it is threatened, there is jealousy, anxiety, and anger. If broken, there is grief and depression" (1988, p. 4). In summary, Attachment Theory proposes: (1) That when an attachment figure is perceived to be unavailable, fear or anxiety will be experienced, whereas when there is certainty that an attachment figure is available a sense of security will be felt; (2) that certainty or uncertainty expectations about the availability of attachment figures is developed throughout childhood and adolescence, and persists throughout life preserved in "working models" of self and other; (3) that adult expectations of accessibility and responsiveness of attachment figures reflect the actual attachment experiences of childhood and adolescence; and (4) that when faced with an unavailable or unresponsive attachment figure, as well as other fear or pain provoking conditions, "attachment behaviors" are undertaken to regain attachment contact. Ostensibly, it is these

attachment behaviors in the form of anger and aggression that are observed in intimate partner abuse.

Indeed, Bowlby (1973, pp. 245-257; 1980, pp. 38-43; 1988, pp. 77-97) described "functional" anger and hostility in children and adults that serves the purpose of seeking reunion with the attachment figure be it parent or intimate partner. However, this otherwise useful attachment behavior becomes maladaptive when uncertainty of attachment figure availability is prolonged, functional anger has become chronic and a working model of inadequate self and unreliable others has developed. Hence, in the absence of a reliably available childhood attachment figure, "anxious attachment" develops where attachment behavior becomes all too easily invoked, and anxious anger emerges as dysfunctional reunion behavior that persists into adulthood. It is within this framework that Bowlby (1988, pp. 77-97) has attempted to articulate understanding of family violence.

Bowlby (1980, pp. 19-22, 38-74) has also discussed the failure of childhood attachment behavior to elicit reunion, and the "emotional detachment" that can ensue. This alternate developmental pathway to "anxious attachment" is presumed to be "a partial or complete deactivation of attachment behavior" that occurs when the immature psychic system is unable to cope with the emotional distress of unfulfilled attachment. It is useful to note for later discussion that Bowlby also postulated an adaptive cognitive mechanism of "selective exclusion" which through perceptual

blocking or filtering excludes memories and current cues associated with insecure attachment. Hence, as Bowlby suggests, what might be of most value to both researchers and clinicians is that which is not consciously available to perpetrators of intimate partner abuse.

Of particular relevance to our investigation of intimate partner abuse, Attachment theory has been applied more specifically as a framework for understanding adult romantic relationships (Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Hazan & Shaver, 1994). The focus of this work has been on attachment styles, drawn from previous developmental studies (see Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, and Wall, 1978). Three attachment styles are of particular importance: Secure, Avoidant, and Anxious/Ambivalent. Hazan and Shaver (1987) found that attachment styles observed in children occur in comparable frequencies in adults, and that adults manifesting different attachment styles also had correspondingly different "love experiences." Moreover, respective attachment styles were associated with "different beliefs about the course of romantic love, the availability and trust-worthiness of love partners, and their own love-worthiness" (i.e. working model of self and others).

Based on the Hazan and Shaver (1987) study, useful descriptions of adult attachment styles are available. Secure Attachment style is marked by the experience of and belief in the persistence of "happy, friendly, and trusting" love experiences, the intensity of which sometimes varies but periodically reaches optimum intensity. Securely attached also perceive

themselves as "likable," perceive others as "well-intentioned and good-hearted," and have the ability to provide unconditional acceptance and support to their partner. Persons with Avoidant Attachment styles are skeptical about the persistence (even the existence) of romantic love, have the lowest positive love experiences, maintain a belief that a love relationship is not a prerequisite to happiness, are fearful of intimacy, and experience jealousy and "emotional highs and lows" in relationships. Avoidant Attached persons maintain a working model of themselves and others that falls in between the self-confidence of Secure Attached and self-doubt of Anxious/Ambivalent Attached persons. It is of note, however, that Avoidant attached persons, like the Securely attached, do not experience themselves as being lonely.

Those with Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment style "yearn for a love relationship involving merger, reciprocation, and intense passion" (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). They readily and frequently feel like they are falling in love, but never actually experience what they would call real love. The love that they do experience is marked by "emotional highs and lows, and extreme sexual attraction and jealousy." The Anxious/Ambivalent also manifest significantly more loneliness, self-doubt, feel "misunderstood and unappreciated, and judge that others are "less willing and able" to commit to relationships than they are.

In keeping with the prediction of Attachment Theory, differences in

Attachment Style corresponded to differences in attachment experiences as children (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Secure Attachment adults reported "warmer" relationships with their parents and between parents. Avoidant Attachment adults "described their mothers as cold and rejecting, and Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment adults characterized their fathers as "unfair." It is notable that although Avoidant and Anxious/Ambivalent attachment styles correspond respectively to stereotypical male and female approaches to intimate relationships, these two styles distribute relatively equally across gender (Hazan & Shaver (1994).

Hazan and Shaver (1994) have drawn on the current state of attachment research to articulate a more comprehensive theory of adult attachment that provides further elaboration of attachment styles. They note that persons manifesting Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment style are plagued by feelings of "fear, anxiety, and loneliness," from which they seek relief in "a state of felt security" hopefully to be found in relationships. In the service of this "felt security" Anxious/Ambivalent persons expend inordinate amounts of energy keeping attachment figures engaged and monitoring their responsiveness. Accompanying this attachment behavior are distress, anger, and a decline in exploratory activity. Anxious/Ambivalent persons also tend to be "indiscriminately and overly self-disclosing, express feelings and needs without consideration of their partner, resort to dysfunctional anger in mutual problem solving, and

experience greater relationship demise. The working models used by Anxious/Ambivalent Attached persons, reflect the inconsistent availability of childhood attachment figures, which predisposes them to expect adult intimate partners to be unreliable, which in turn escalates fears and monitoring of abandonment cues.

Accordingly, Hazan and Shaver (1994) elaborate on the Avoidant Attachment style which is characterized by pursuit of "felt security" by avoiding intimate relationships or remaining distant in them, pursuing uncommitted sexual relationships, alcohol or drug abuse, or compensating by intense involvement in nonrelational activities. Avoidant Attached persons refrain from self-disclosure and are uncomfortable with such disclosure from significant others. The working model of Avoidant Attached persons reflects a history of "consistent unresponsiveness" from childhood attachment figures. Hence, as adults, the Avoidant Attached expect to be rejected by intimate partners and regulate attachment anxiety by distracting themselves and avoiding intimacy.

Research on Attachment in Intimate Partner Abuse

With the foundation of attachment theory and attachment styles in place, it remains necessary to apply specific attachment principles to intimate partner abuse. Based on the propositions of Attachment Theory, several predictions can be made regarding men who abuse their intimate partners. First, there should be evidence of significant attachment anxiety in

these men. Second, working models of inadequate self and/or attachment figure should be evident. Third, there should be evidence of inadequate attachment histories in the family of origin with abusive men. Fourth, abusive behavior conceived of as attachment behavior should occur most reliably in response to perceived unavailability of attachment figure. Finally, attachment style should illuminate abusive behavior in intimate partner abuse.

Research on intimate partner abuse has revealed evidence of a relationship between anxious attachment and "a personality constellation of abusiveness" (Dutton, Saunders, Starzomski, & Bartholomew, 1994). Dutton et al., found that physically abusive men scored significantly higher than nonabusive men on attachment styles referred to as "fearful" (anxious/avoidant) and "preoccupied" (anxious/ambivalent) patterns, while nonabusive men scored significantly higher on secure attachment. While both anxious attachment patterns were related to this constellation of abuse, "fearful" attachment was most strongly associated with abusive features of anger, jealousy, trauma symptoms, and Borderline Personality Organization. With respect to the latter, Dutton et al. (1994), observed that the strength of the relationship between Borderline Personality Organization and fearful attachment was strong enough to suggest that Borderline Personality Organization may be a specific representation of fearful attachment style.

Several other findings and comments by Dutton et al. (1994b) provide additional insight into the relationship between attachment dynamics and intimate partner abuse. First, it was observed that compared to nonabusive men, fearfully attached abusive men were "less affectively stable" manifesting high chronic anxiety and anger. In keeping with attachment theory this chronic affective state is arguably a testament to the persistent hypersensitivity of an attachment system in dysfunctional mode due to prolonged childhood attachment uncertainty. Moreover, Dutton, Saunders, Starzomski, and Bartholomew (1994) suggest that controlling behaviors observed in men who abuse their intimate partners might be better understood as control over "that which is most feared: namely, the degree of intimacy or emotional distance" from the intimate partner. A second observation of particular note was that anxiously attached abusive men scored high on measures of trauma and dissociation, which reportedly assess symptoms "characteristic of sexual abuse experiences, but which may also occur as a result of other types of trauma" (Dutton et al., 1994). This finding is perhaps suggestive of the deeper psychological trauma experienced by these men which could escalate already maladaptive attachment dynamics. It is notable as well in view of the observed dissociation tendency, not to mention customary male socialization of silence regarding trauma such as sexual abuse, that the role of intrapsychic anguish, in the form of trauma or attachment neglect, in intimate partner

abuse would not be easily assessed amongst male perpetrators.

It is of note that the dissociative element - which is reminiscent of Bowlby's (1980, pp. 38-74) "selective exclusion" - is implicated in some of the research on intimate partner abuse. For example, Saunders (1992), in discussing the shallow affective experience of abusive men, postulated a parallel mechanism of "affective numbing" to facilitated detachment from feelings. Similarly, Dutton, Saunders, Starzomski, and Bartholomew (1994) assert that in the fearfully attached, "anger is an aspect of attachment independent of what transpires interpersonally." Hence, it is arguable that the dissociative tendency, in the service of excluding awareness of attachment anguish, obscures the true source of experienced anger and permits it to be "both blamed and projected onto the attachment object."

Evidence of the role of attachment anxiety/anger in intimate partner abuse also emerges from other sources. Dutton (1994b) refers to his previous research on responses of abusive men to scenarios in which intimate female partners appear to be establishing independence and emotional distance. The observed "abandonment panic" and escalation in anger to the "anticipated loss" of significant other, combined with reference to similar findings led Dutton to assert that severe abuse "appears to be generated by issues that signal relationship loss," which is suggestive once again of activation of attachment issues for these men. Indeed, it has been observed elsewhere that women are at greater risk of abuse, even homicide,

when they separate from their male intimate partners than when they remain in the relationship, once again alluding to the significance of attachment anxiety to such abuse. Similarly, the role of attachment anxiety invoked by threats to availability of the intimate partner or difficulty maintaining attachment are implicit in observed couple conflict strategies of withdrawal (Lloyd, 1990), husband demand/wife withdrawal communication patterns (Babcock, Waltz, Jacobson, & Gottman, 1993), as well as abusive men's diminished coping with perceived wife rejection and embarrassment (Holtzworth-Munroe, & Anglin, 1991), and fear of partner abandonment in Generally abusive men (Saunders, 1992). Moreover, as the previous review of personality organization and disorder in men who abuse their intimate partners reveals, the dominant feature of personality profiles of these men is that of difficulty initiating and maintaining intimate relationships, which may be indicative of attachment anxiety. In short, there appears to be good evidence of attachment anxiety in men who abuse their intimate partners.

Support for the attachment model prediction that men who abuse their intimate partners would possess inadequate working models of self and others is evident first in the profiles of the fearful and preoccupied attachment styles observed in abusive men (Dutton et al., 1994). Both of these styles are marked by a "negative self-model." The fearful attachment pattern manifests a working model of negative self and negative other, while preoccupied attachment manifests a model of negative self and positive

other. The secure attachment pattern, on the other hand manifests a positive self and positive other working model. Other studies, sometimes with different research foci, also produce findings suggesting that abusive men have inadequate working models of self and others. Several studies have observed inadequate self-esteem or dissatisfaction with self among men who abuse their intimate partners (Flournoy & Wilson, 1991; Goldstein & Rosenbaum, 1985; Hamberger & Hastings, 1986; Murphy, Meyer, & O'Leary, 1993; Murphy, Meyer, & O'Leary, 1994), especially for Generally abusive men (Cadsky & Crawford, 1988; Saunders, 1992). Moreover, the distrust and jealousy dimensions that pervade personality organization and disorder observed in the previous review of personality in men who abuse their intimate partners alludes to a negative working model of others.

Finally, evidence is available that appears to support the attachment theory prediction that anxious attached men who abuse their intimate partners would have experienced uncertainty or unavailability of childhood attachment figures. At the outset, it is arguable that witnessed and experienced family of origin abuse may well have been experienced as uncertainty of attachment figure availability, and contributed to "deviant developmental continuities" (Murphy, Meyer, & O'Leary, 1993) in attachment formation for those men exposed to such conditions (see previous review). Similarly, findings that perpetrators of intimate partner abuse not exposed to family of origin violence had been exposed to more

severe discipline (Caesar, 1988; Hershorn & Rosenbaum, 1991) may be interpreted as threats to attachment figure availability. Moreover, several studies have found explicit evidence of parental rejection and neglect which would conform to attachment theory prediction of uncertainty of childhood attachment experiences (Dutton, 1994b; Dutton & Starzomski, 1993; Hershorn & Rosenbaum, 1991; Rivera & Widom, 1990).

References to dependent characteristics in men who abuse their intimate partners (see Flournoy & Wilson, 1991; Hamberger & Hastings, 1986; Murphy, Meyer, & O'Leary, 1994) provides further testimony to the role of attachment, attachment anxiety, and a corresponding working model of unacceptable self and unreliable other. In a comparison of abusive and nonabusive men in intimate relationships, Murphy, Meyer and O'Leary (1994) found significantly greater general interpersonal and spouse-specific dependency among men who had abused their intimate partners. In this study it was also observed that these men demonstrated "stronger emotional investment" in their intimate relationships while excluding other social attachments, fear of abandonment, and "relationship dependent self-esteem."

Murphy et al., (1994) note that emotional engagement or disengagement during relationship conflicts may be a critical distinguishing feature between abusive and nonabusive men in intimate relationships. That is, because of their strong emotional investment in the relationship, abusive

men are unable to regulate "emotional distance" from their partner. This notion of significant emotional investment in intimate relationships has also been observed as a variable in intimate partner abuse in lesbian relationships (Lockhart, White, Causby, & Isaac, 1994). Indeed, Coleman (1994) has observed that "abusive lesbians demonstrate personality traits similar to those of heterosexual men who batter," including the "merger" impulse in relationships. Lockhart et al., observed in their study that victims of physical abuse in lesbian relationships perceived their partners to have "had a greater need for social fusion." Hart, Dutton, and Newlove (1993) provide clarification of the notion of dependency as it applies to attachment anxiety. These researchers failed to observe significant levels of dependency in their study of personality organization among men who had abused their intimate partner. They suggest, however, that the "passive, inhibited" features of Dependent Personality, should be distinguished from the "active" feature of dependency of "insecure attachment" which is more characteristic of Borderline personalities. In discussing the role of Borderline Personality Organization in intimate partner abuse, Dutton (1994b) illuminates the nature of merger or fusion in relational attachment by men who abuse their intimate partners. At the root of the problem, according to Dutton, is a "fragile selfhood" in this group of abusive men "that depends on the female partner for stability while denying and masking dependency on her." Hence, with the anxiously attached abusive men, intimate

relationships are "asked to do the impossible" and preserve the chronically unstable self. The obsessive demands for merger with the intimate partner, along with inadequate ability to communicate relationship needs and perhaps the woman's inability to meet the onerous demands of the fragile self, inevitably results in "dysphoric stalemates" which further threaten the self and invoke "primitive defenses" of externalization of the problem on the woman. Inevitably, such externalization may escalate to severe intimate partner abuse.

In all, these dependency and merger findings suggest that men who abuse their intimate partners may be overly compensating for inadequate attachment histories, and that indeed attachment anxiety is implicit in their presentation in intimate relationships. This should not, however, be taken as a characterization of men who abuse their intimate partners as single mindedly and desperately seeking out intense attachment opportunities. These men may also be ambivalent about such attachments. Indeed, in a study of interpersonal orientation, men who had abused their intimate partners were characterized as socially cautious and uncomfortable, as well as interpersonally isolated and avoiding intimate social contact (Allen, Calsyn, Fehrenbach, & Benton, 1989). In keeping with personality findings men in this study who abused their intimate partners had "difficulties developing social relationships, trusting others," as well as "expressing feelings of affection and being deeply intimate."

The final support for an Attachment approach to intimate partner abuse is drawn from what may be construed as a novel approach to understanding this phenomenon. Indeed, it seems surprising that Lackey and Williams (1995) appear to be a minority amongst researchers into intimate partner abuse in focusing on variables that contribute to the "cessation" of intergenerational transmission of abusive behaviors. In this study of the effects of "social bonding" on intimate partner abuse, "men's attachment to their partner" was most influential in increasing nonviolence probability among men who had been exposed to family of origin violence. It is of note that the effect of attachment to partner was more significant in ending intergenerational transmission of violence than social bonds with friends, relatives, and community. Moreover, the effect of attachment to partner was significantly greater than belief in the likelihood of negative community sanction, although the latter did contribute to cessation of intergenerational transmission effects. Hence, the authors of this study assert that "cessation of violent behavior from one's family of origin to adult intimate relationships is influenced by a social bonding process that operates more effectively as the intimacy of the 'social object' of bonding increases." A cautionary note is in order with this study, however, in so far as the effect of social bonding only applied to those exposed to family of origin violence, and not those without a violent family legacy.

Conclusion To Research On Intimate Partner Abuse

It is perhaps evident that extant research findings on intimate partner abuse span a continuum from social to person variables. It may also be evident that a good deal of disagreement manifests across theoretical approaches and research findings. While some commonality may be construed in Family Violence and Feminist approaches to intimate partner abuse, it is difficult to reconcile such agreement with Typology, Personality, and Interpersonal Attachment approaches. After some 25 years of research on intimate partner abuse, it is arguable that the state of understanding of this phenomenon has hardly achieved unequivocal status. Indeed, the preponderance of conflicting theory and research could leave the naive onlooker who lacks presuppositions on the matter bewildered indeed.

Notwithstanding the evident disparity in theory and research, one significant commonality of investigations into intimate partner abuse is the overwhelming use of quantitative research methodology. Of the nearly two hundred studies reviewed for the present discussion, a decided bias in favour of quantitative method was observed. The preferred research method in intimate partner abuse has been the administration of questionnaire surveys, standardized assessment, and/or structured interviews. Some researchers have complimented quantitative research with qualitative methods by including open ended questions in interviews (see Lloyd, 1990; Stout, 1993). Similarly, some investigations of intimate partner abuse have

drawn on clinical observations (Bernard & Bernard, 1984; Gondolf, 1985); however, no studies were found which explicitly and exclusively used qualitative methodology.

Characteristically quantitative studies have effectively held men who perpetrate intimate partner abuse at arms length. Indeed, early research which formed the foundation for Feminist models of intimate partner abuse, drew primarily upon responses from the abused women, without surveying the men. The validity of this strategy was, of course, confounded by the possible perceptual bias of the women in question. In due course, researchers did turn to the men as respondents; however, the controlled nature of quantitative research driven by hypotheses and the inevitable theoretical biases in test construction, hardly permitted these men to inform us of their experience unfettered by method.

It is arguable, therefore, that the characterization of men who perpetrate intimate partner abuse based on extant research is a superficial one, clouded by a methodology with an "outside" perspective, that is limited in ability to delve very deeply into these men as persons. Moreover, failure to acknowledge that batterers are persons who filter and give meaning to experiences within and around them may be the reason that current theories and findings are so deficient in explaining this phenomenon.
Notwithstanding the positive contributions of extant quantitative research, it has not succeeded in clarifying the phenomenon sufficiently to formulate an

understanding of intimate partner abuse that bridges the conflicting findings and permit formulation of an effective intervention strategy (for a critique of treatment program efficacy see Rosenfeld, 1992). It is arguable, therefore, that in the continuing pursuit of resolution to the problem of intimate partner abuse, investigation with qualitative methodology may more fully illuminate the problem.

CHAPTER FOUR

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In view of the aforementioned limitations of quantitative methodology, a qualitative phenomenological method was selected for the present study. In doing so, it was hoped that insight could be acquired that would contribute to a more certain understanding of the phenomenon of intimate partner abuse by altering the method and focus of study. By asking men who perpetrate intimate partner abuse to describe their experience with this phenomenon, greater control over the research process is placed in the hands of the men who are closer to the phenomenon than any detached researcher could ever be. The present study was reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee of the Department of Educational Psychology, University of Alberta.

METHOD

Participants

A volunteer sample of men who had identified themselves as having abused their female partners were solicited by mail and telephone from community agencies that dealt with domestic violence in the province of Alberta. Sampling was extended to the general public by advertising in a major newspaper and with a poster campaign. With this "purposive sample" (Berg, 1989, p. 110) a deliberate attempt was made to recruit men who had

direct experience as perpetrators of wife abuse and who could, therefore, best illuminate the phenomenon. Hence, the primary inclusion criterion was whether the men acknowledged having abused their intimate partners. Despite vigorous recruitment efforts, only five men responded and volunteered for the study. Much of the published research on intimate partner abuse has relied on captive samples of men ordered into treatment programs. Hence, the voluntary nature of the present sample may account for the comparatively few men presenting themselves for the study. Similarly, this poor sampling is perhaps understandable in view of the intimate nature of the interview process in which these men risk exposure of what may be a fragile self. It is also possible that men who are struggling with the effects of having abused their intimate partners and may not have the psychological resources necessary to expose themselves to a stranger. Future phenomenological studies of this sort will certainly need to more effectively address such sampling difficulties.

Demographics

The five men interviewed ranged in age from 32 to 40. All participants were employed, three worked as tradesmen, one as a labourer, and one as a technician. Participant annual incomes ranged from $30,000 to $48,000. All participants had completed high school, one had completed an undergraduate degree, and another had completed two years of college. Three participants had been legally married in long term relationships (more

than 10 years) to the women whom they had abused, while the remaining two had been in short term (2-4 years) common-law relationships with the victims. Only one participant still resided with the woman he had abused.

Participants reported physical abuse behavior profiles that respectively included: Eight years of frequent and severe physical abuse that included rape; six to eight physical assaults over a 9 year period; frequent slapping and hitting; and a single violent assault that included choking the partner. One participant denied directly physically assaulting his wife, but did admit to engaging in physical intimidation displays that included property damage by putting his fists and foot through walls. Four participants admitted to using extensive verbal and psychological abuse as well. The two most severe physical abusers reported not having abused their wives for the past 5 and 1.5 years respectively, and they had both undergone extensive counselling. Two had only recently ceased their abusive behavior, partially because of marital separation, and had just begun anger management programs. One of the latter had been charged with assault. The last participant who had restricted his abuse to property destruction and physical displays, had only recently been separated from his wife, was not engaged in counselling, and had a restraining order against him.

Procedure

Initial contact with all participants was by telephone, initiated by all but one participant in response to my plea for volunteers. The latter was

referred to me by a community professional and I initiated contact. Data collection involved a two stage process. Four participants were met and interviewed in a secure room at the University of Alberta, while the fifth was interviewed, at his request, in his home. All participants were briefed on the purpose and nature of the research, and advised of ethical and anonymity protections. As well all participants signed a release form which identified myself and my affiliation, and outlined my obligations as researcher. Interviews were audio recorded.

Interviews were unstructured and participants were simply asked to describe their experiences as perpetrators of intimate partner abuse. Prompts and paraphrases were used to obtain clarification and to maintain a focus on their experience of abuse. The extent to which these were used varied across participants. With the exception of demographic questions at the end of the interview, a deliberate attempt was made to refrain from controlling the interview with pointed or directive questions. Participants were encouraged to describe experiences before, during, and after specific battering events, and spanning the period of abuse.

A follow-up interview was planned to obtain feedback on the validity of thematic analysis. This phase of the study was only completed with three of the participants. One participant could not be contacted at the telephone number provided, and one declined because of scheduling problems. It remains that this feature of the study was not as productive as

hoped, which may be attributable to the six month delay in resuming contact with some. All three follow-up participants voluntarily reported having obtained unspecified insight from the first interview. Only one participant showed enthusiasm about the thematic analysis. All three, however, wanted to continue talking about their experience. Agreement was obtained from these three participants regarding the primary themes. Each participant appeared to dwell on at least one feature that was most significant for them.

Bracketing

Before proceeding on to the data analysis phase of the study, it is appropriate, as is the custom in phenomenological research, to articulate the presuppositions that I possess regarding intimate partner abuse. At the outset, my motivation for undertaking this study is twofold. First, having been privy to the effects of intimate partner abuse on women and children in my practice as a clinician, and indeed among female friends, I have been struck deeply and personally by the need to understand and seek greater resolution to the phenomenon than currently exists. Second, I have developed over the years an abiding interest in the psychological welfare of men. My concern for the welfare of men is further based on a presupposition that despite possible socio-political advantages held by men versus women, such advantages do not necessarily translate into greater psychological wellbeing. Inherent in this presupposition is the further assumption that compared to women, the psychological needs of men have

effectively been neglected, dismissed and denied within the social sciences and the prevailing sociocultural milieu. Hence, while I am motivated to seek relief for women who have been and might be abused, I am at the same time motivated to view men who perpetrate abuse in a way that makes them human and worthy of compassionate help.

It is notable as well that I possess a decidedly psychological bias which inspires me to seek out psychological and not sociological answers to questions. Hence, I approached this study with the assumption that we could better understand intimate partner abuse by looking more closely at the psychology of those that perpetrate it than the broader social setting in which it takes place. This particular bias, combined with the observation that upwards to 90% of men socialized in and exposed to the hypothetical culture of violence, do not perpetrate intimate partner abuse, leaves me skeptical of sociological interpretations of this phenomenon. Moreover, in keeping with my sensitivity to the plight of men, I cautiously doubt that men who abuse their intimate partners are necessarily psychopathological. Rather, in keeping with my existential-humanist sentiments, I embarked on this study with the assumption that men who abuse their partners are essentially good people wrestling with the basic issues of life, and perhaps not doing very well at it. Finally, in keeping with this perception of struggling men, supported by an understanding of anger - which is a hallmark of intimate partner abuse (Barnett, Fagan, & Booker, 1991; Maiuro,

Cahn, Vitaliano, Wagner, & Zegree, 1988; Martin, 1985, p. 45) - as a manifestation of emotional anguish (see de Zulueta, 1993; Tavris, 1989), I proceeded with the expectation that men who abuse their partners would be men wrestling with the experience of emotional pain.

It is within the ambience of the preceding presuppositions that I selected intimate partner abusive men as a critical target group for study. The intention of such a study is that of enhancing the psychological wellbeing of, what may arguably be our most psychologically disabled subgroup of men, by achieving greater understanding of their experience as perpetrators of intimate partner abuse.

Data Analysis

Interviews were audio recorded and then transcribed into text, which formed participant protocols. Identifying features such as names, occupations, and location were changed to protect anonymity. A hierarchical thematic analysis procedure was used to illuminate the structure of the experience of abusing as perceived by participants. The steps used in this study follow those outlined by Colaizzi (1978, pp. 59-62). An initial reading of each protocol was undertaken to obtain an impression of the meaning of abusive experiences for respective participants and to identify preliminary themes. Statements relevant to the phenomenon were then identified as meaning units. These statements were paraphrased to reflect the essential meaning and given a representative theme label. Respective

themes were explicitly defined based on a synthesis of associated meaning units. The outcome of this meaning analysis was a first order cluster of defined themes that formed the critical features of each participant's experience. A second order clustering was undertaken in which themes with shared properties were organized to form a higher order structure that captured the essence of abuser experience. This "within persons" (Osborne, 1990) analysis was concluded by writing a narrative synthesis of each experience. Finally, an "across persons" analysis was conducted in which convergence and divergence of participant experiences were examined in order to illuminate a "shared structure" of experience that generalized across participants.

The results of the analysis were arranged in tabular format. Appendices One through Five and contain the data from the first level of thematic analysis for respective participants. Representative excerpts from the interview protocols are listed in the first column. Column two contains paraphrases that summarize the content of the corresponding meaning units from column one, and represents the first level of analysis abstraction. Column three contains theme terms that reflect the interpreted essential meaning of each statement. Tables 1:0 through 5:0 contain the first order thematic clusters and theme definitions for respective participants. Tables 1:1 through 5:1 provide a summary of the second level of thematic analysis. Table 6:0 provides a synthesis of themes across all five participants, and

table 6:1 provides a comparison of those themes by participant and second order cluster.

CHAPTER FIVE

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Ian's Experience

Results and Discussion

The first level of thematic analysis is illustrated in Appendix One, which contains a sample of meaning units from Ian's interview protocol (column 1), paraphrases summarizing corresponding meaning units (column 2), and theme terms (column 3). The eleven themes that form this first order cluster are named and defined in table 1:0 (p. 86). Table 1:1 (p. 88) provides a further level of abstraction that clusters the 11 first order themes into a higher order structure composed of three essential themes. In the following synthesis of experience, cited themes are drawn from meaning units identified in Ian's protocol. To understand the process of thematic extraction, the reader is encouraged to refer to Appendix One which contains samples of the meaning units upon which themes are based. In the synthesis, numbers in brackets refer to examples of meaning units and their respective themes.

Synthesis of Ian's Experience.

The eleven themes from Table 1:0 (p. 86) form a detailed profile of Ian's experience as an abuse perpetrator. At the outset, Ian reported an Anger Theme where he felt plagued by unrelenting, sometimes

"overwhelming" anger (10). His anger would vary in intensity, but could escalate, in a spiraling fashion, to explosive levels that culminated in uncontrollable dramatic somatic arousal and violence. He was, however, subtly aware that his anger was "triggered" by another underlying emotion which he "couldn't touch" (10). In due course, Ian revealed that the escalating frequency of his anger appeared to correlate with, and indeed contribute to, declining happiness.

The underlying emotion reported in Ian's anger manifests more explicitly in the Anguish Theme. Anguish for Ian was experienced as an unbearable, "burning" (34) emotional pain that "snuck up" (8) on him. In the experience of Anguish, it becomes more evident that the "unhappiness" (2) associated with Anger involves a dissatisfaction with himself. Perhaps the most distinguishing feature of Anguish is its characterization as impending existential and emotional disintegration. To Ian this was "life and death stuff" (3) that could not be acknowledged out of fear that he would "fall to pieces." The aversive significance of this theme materialized when marital separation occurred. During that development he experienced intense "physical, burning pain" (34) throughout his body, accompanied by desperate ruminations in which he felt certain that, "she's got to come back or I'm dead" (35).

Accompanying the Anger and Anguish is a Dependence Theme wherein Ian experienced the existence of his "being" to be under Kathy's

"control" (28). The absence of her affirmation of or need for him, was to "become like nobody" (19), and constituted "a life and death situation." It is of significance that this dependence was not restricted to an abstract existential issue of identity. Rather, the dependent "being" is fundamentally and importantly, an emotional being that relied upon Kathy to "feel good" (16). The essence of this affective dimension of existential dependence is captured by Ian's comment that, "she fed me emotionally" (22). Associated with and implicit in Dependence is a Fragile Self Theme which reflects Ian's low self-worth and inability to accept himself. During the period in which Ian abused Kathy, he was not especially conscious of the experience of Fragile Self; however, he did identify self acceptance as a key issue in resolving his abusive tendencies.

Ian could not, therefore, envisage himself independent of Kathy and was plagued by the chronic threat that she might withdraw affirmation, and leave him intolerably alone (13). Indeed, this threat to Dependence manifested as a Repudiation Theme where Ian perceived Kathy as rejecting, neglectful, inattentive, and/or emotionally unavailable. These perceptions of disaffirmation were accompanied by the anguish and fear of existential disintegration that "made life hell" (15). Ian also described an Attachment Theme that appears to have important implications for Repudiation. In Attachment Ian experienced the "ecstasy" of intense affirmation from Kathy early in their relationship, that made him feel "ten feet high" (6). After two

to three years, however, Repudiation manifested where Ian began to perceive that he wasn't "anything to her" and feeling "very quietly, very subtly a little bit alone" (5).

Altogether, the six themes of Anger, Anguish, Dependence, Fragile Self, Repudiation, and Attachment form a second order thematic cluster labeled Disintegration Despair (Table 1:1, p. 88). This cluster reflects Ian's experience of himself as an unacceptable and inadequate being who has known, and believed, that he could only know the feeling of being, through Kathy's acceptance and affirmation. The experience of being through affirmation is, however, elusive. Rather, he faces chronic threats to affirmation and being, which invoke intense feelings of existential anxiety, anger, and ultimately violence.

A second cluster of themes form what could be characterized as Ian's response to Disintegration Despair. This cluster has been labeled Preservation, and is composed of Nescience, Validation, External-Material, and Rumination themes. As the label implies, the themes in this cluster represent Ian's experienced need to actively secure affirmation of his being by making Kathy "need" him, through material accomplishment, and through cognitive distortion. It also reflects his experience of consciously and unconsciously attempting to defend his fragile self from further disintegration when he becomes conscious of the effects of his actions, and/or Repudiation is perceived.

In the service of Preservation, the Nescience Theme reflects Ian's experience of not being very aware of himself or the dynamics of his abusive behavior. He was generally unaware of the origins of his anger and anguish, as well as his violent impulses. Rather, emotions and behavior appear to emerge suddenly and unexpectedly from nowhere. This kind of unintentional Nescience is perhaps reminiscent of the psychoanalytic notion of suppression. Indeed, Ian appears to engage in intentional Nescience where he actively suppresses guilt about the harm he has caused Kathy, by becoming "pretty numb" (31).

In the Validation Theme, Ian experienced compelling and urgent impulses to actively obtain affirmation of his being, remove threats to his being, and/or recapture the conditions that produced feelings of affirmation of self. With Kathy this was reportedly pursued by attempting "to create the scenario where she was going to want me and need me" (9). Validation is also sought in a specific form with the External-Material Theme. Here Ian experiences impulses in which he appears to seek affirmation of self and happiness through financial, material, and familial accomplishments.

Finally, a forth component of this cluster, the Rumination Theme, appears to serve both the Nescience and Validation themes. In Rumination, Ian experiences himself compelled "to work out each and every situation" in his mind in order to be certain that his actions "were appropriate, justified, and provoked" (29). In so doing, he justifies his Validation efforts, distorts

some of Kathy's responses as affirmations, and purges negative feelings of guilt and self-doubt. One paradoxical effect is that Rumination on occasion actually escalates feelings of Anguish and Anger.

Paradoxical Control, which forms the final second order cluster, is dominated by a Constraint Theme in which Ian felt helplessly out of control of himself and his situation, yet driven by the inescapable impulse to acquire and maintain control. Ian experienced himself as controlled by Kathy and his social milieu, by his own "addiction" (24) to her favour, and paradoxically perceived himself to have had control over Kathy that was, however, "slipping away" (38). Constraint is also significantly implicated Ian's Anger, Dependence, Nescience, and Validation Themes. Anger is something that is "overwhelming" (1) and is not, therefore, experienced as something over which he has control. His Dependence on Kathy for existential and emotional survival is experienced as "an addiction" (24) and to be without his "fix" is "torture." In the Nescience theme, lack of control is implicit in the unexpected suddenness with which Ian experienced emotions and violent impulses, while intentional control manifests in attempts to suppress guilt and awareness. Finally, Ian is driven by the impulse to gain control over himself and Kathy in the Validation Theme.

Summary of Ian's Experience

The three, second order thematic clusters (Table 1:1, p. 88) of Disintegration Despair, Preservation, and Paradoxical Control, compose the

essential structure of Ian's experience as a wife abuser. He lived in the shadow of a subtle and alarming Anguish which was itself rooted in a fragile self chronically threatened by a desperate fear of emotional and existential disintegration. Refuge from the Anguish of disintegration depended upon increasingly unreliable and elusive external affirmation of self, especially from Kathy. Anger appears to mask the intolerable Anguish precipitated by perceived rejection, as well as serve an instrumental function in seeking external Validation of self from Kathy. Ian's experience is, therefore, marked by active Preservation of self and avoidance of Anguish. This appears to be accomplished through conscious and unconscious emotional, cognitive, and behavioral control. Paradoxically, he is caught between the desperate relentless drive to maintain control of himself and his identity through another person, while experiencing a simultaneous disempowering helplessness in his ability to do so. Within the milieu of Ian's experience, therefore, abusive acts of control, anger, and violence appear as expressions of acute existential and emotional pain, and as desperate attempts to avoid such pain.

Table 1:0
First Order Thematic Description of Ian's Experience

1. Anger.	The experience of being possessed by a persistent state of anger that fluctuated in intensity, and that at its peak was accompanied by overwhelming somatic symptoms. Each episode manifested a spiraling effect in which escalating anger culminated in violence. Often accompanied by a sense that other powerful emotions underlie the anger. Over the history of the abuse, anger intensity and frequency escalates as his sense of happiness vanishes. (1,10,25,41)
2. Anguish.	A subtle and unbearable emotional pain, experienced as a threat to existential survival and which had to be vigorously avoided. Its periodic manifestation was associated with onset of anger and awareness of dissatisfaction with himself. The full force and somatic representation of this emotional distress became manifested upon final marital separation. (2,3,8,34)
3. Constraint.	Characterized as an inescapable addiction and helplessness, this is a complex of experiences marked by the presence or absence of control with respect to himself or her. Manifests as an inability to escape dependence on her, feeling controlled by her, inability to control himself, being possessed by his emotions, and of being driven by the need to act to regain control. Includes awareness of male socialization constraints on "legal" emotional experience and expression outside of marital relationships. (12,24,26,38)
4. Dependence.	The prevailing experience of existential and emotional dependence. His perception that he exists as a living, sentient, and valued being only by virtue of her affirmation of him. In the absence of her presence or favour, he fears existential and emotional disintegration. (13,16,19,22,23,28)

5. External-Material	Perception that self-worth and happiness hinge on financial, material, and familial accomplishments. Includes a perception of self-worth accruing from the possession of a stereotypical, subservient wife. (32,33)
6. Fragile Self.	Nescient low self-worth and inability to accept himself. He provides post hoc speculation that inability to accept himself was instrumental in precipitating his abusiveness, and that self acceptance was a key to resolving his abusiveness. (18,42,43)
7. Nescience.	The largely unintentional absence of awareness of the origins of emotions, experience, and behavior that appeared reflexively with unexpected suddenness. Sometimes manifests as perceptual distortion. Includes intentional nescience where he actively suppresses awareness to avoid unpleasant feelings such as guilt. (11,27,31,40)
8. Attachment.	A significant attachment experience, early in their relationship, in which he felt especially good about himself. Conveyed as a profound enlivening or affirming experience, based on her approval of him. (6,7)
9. Repudiation.	The experience of rejection and disaffirmation of self. Marked by anguish, fear, and the feeling that he was on the brink of existential disintegration - of falling apart. Accompanies perceived rejection, inattentiveness, emotional abandonment or non-responsiveness from her. (5,14,15,17,39)
10. Rumination.	Cognitive deliberation over or rationalizing of events in order to justify his actions, as well as to purge feelings of self-doubt and guilt. Includes a measure of cognitive distortion of her responses as reconciliation or compliance. Also serves to aggravate feelings of anguish, and promotes anger. (29,30,35,37)

11. Validation. A highly compelling impulse to remove threats to his self, as well as create or recapture conditions and feelings that affirm his self. The compulsion to take action that assures external affirmation of his self and nurtures emotional existence.
(4,9,20,21,36)

Table 1:1
Second Order Thematic Description of Ian's Experience

1. Disintegration Despair:	(1) Anger
	(2) Anguish
	(4) Dependence
	(9) Repudiation
	(6) Fragile Self
	(8) Attachment
2. Preservation:	(7) Nescience
	(10) Rumination
	(11) Validation
	(5) External-Material
3. Paradoxical Control:	(3) Constraint (Anger)

Peter's Abuse Experience

Results and Discussion

The first level of thematic analysis is illustrated in Appendix Two, which contains a sample of meaning units from Peter's interview protocol (column 1), paraphrases summarizing corresponding meaning units (column 2), and theme terms (column 3). The eleven themes that form this first order cluster are named and defined in table 2:0 (p. 97). Table 2:1 (p. 100) provides a further level of abstraction that clusters the 11 first order themes into a higher order structure composed of three essential themes. In the following synthesis of experience, cited themes are drawn from meaning units identified in Peter's protocol. To understand the process of thematic extraction, the reader is encouraged to refer to Appendix Two which contains samples of the meaning units upon which themes are based. In the synthesis, numbers in brackets refer to examples of meaning units and their respective themes.

Synthesis of Peter's Abuse Experience:

The eleven themes from Table 2:0 (p. 97) form a detailed profile of Peter's experience as an abuse perpetrator. Peter's experience reveals an Anger Theme in which comments by Candice would "touch something inside" (6), provoke sudden feelings of "rage and hurt" (43), the urge to "hurt her" in retaliation (23), and an impulse to "flee" from the conflict. Peter experienced the precipitating issue as "inconsequential" (7), but was

unable to recall the specifics. Indeed, he reported amnesia surrounding most of his abusive episodes and suggested that his wife would be a better informant in that regard. Peter also alluded to a source of anguish associated with his anger, in so far as anger was not clearly distinguished from "fear" (7) or "hurt" (43).

Indeed, an Anguish Theme forms an integral part of Peter's experience. He described a "hurt factor . . . deep inside" (9) that was accompanied by "the feeling or the need to be on the defensive." Anguish was also characterized by feelings of "desperation" and "fear" (15), hopelessness and the impulse "to lash out at something" (13). In its more innocuous form, Anguish involved feelings of being hurt through perceived unjust treatment (10) and "betrayal" (44) by Candice. More acute Anguish was described as "pent up emotion that's deep within" (26) and at times "takes control" and expresses itself in "a sudden burst of energy" declaring, "Here's me. Hear me roar." The aversive significance of Peter's internal Anguish experience is perhaps illustrated by the avoidant response of being externally "focused right on her" (43), and the desperate wish to "get away" (23) during abusive episodes.

Although it does not manifest exclusively and specifically to abusive episodes, Peter's experience includes an Inferior Self Theme. Peter characterized himself as "nothing" (27), "scared of the outside world," and "inferior to other people" (46). He reported having an "absolute fear of

failing," a great fear of public "ridicule" and "humiliation" if he did fail, as well as a "fear of rejection" in social settings. Paradoxically Peter sought refuge from his fear of social rejection in his relationship with Candice; however, the positive self-esteem that he did experience at work "would drop off dramatically" when he went home (46). It is notable, as well, that Peter reported a significant level of social dependency on Candice, and felt like he was simply tagging along during social engagements. Finally, Peter's Inferior Self experience intensified in the form of shame and fear of discovery surrounding his abusive behavior and the risk of marital demise.

Peter provided comments concerning the initial phase of his relationship with Candice that form an Attachment Theme. Initial Attachment was characterized by communication which involved open sharing of "each other's story," mutual expression of sympathy and comforting over life difficulties, and reciprocal dependency. This positive Attachment continued for approximately five years during which Peter experienced the relationship as "accommodating," cooperative, and equal. However, as his "comfort zone increased" (32), Peter perceived himself as able to "get away with stuff" and experienced himself "start controlling."

With the increase in relational comfort and onset of controlling impulses, a Repudiation Theme appeared to emerge in Peter's experience. He reportedly experienced Candice's interests in her career and her comments about his behavior, to be "a personal affront" and implicit

rejection of him. As the number of abusive episodes increased, Repudiation became more clearly defined and indeed threatening. With each new abusive episode, Peter began experiencing the fear that "she might not understand and make up" (16), as well as the "fear of losing her." Peter clarified that in Repudiation, "the biggest fear was her leaving me, and being by myself" (17). Indeed, at that point in his life Peter had never lived on his own.

The five themes of Anger, Anguish, Inferior Self, Attachment, and Repudiation form a second order thematic cluster labeled Disintegration Despair (Table 2:1; p. 100). For Peter Disintegration Despair reflects his life long experience of an inadequate self from which he only briefly obtained relief and strengthening through affirmation during the Attachment phase of his relationship with Candice. The inadequate self is a fragile self that easily descended into the Anguish of fear and emotional pain. Residing "deep inside" and unacknowledged, the inadequate self when rejected or reminded of its nothingness by the one person who once gave it a semblance of existence, announced its scars of Anguish in the desperate explosive rage of abuse.

Peter manifests a series of themes which were arguably in response to Disintegration Despair. In the Nescience Theme, he experienced sudden onset and brief duration of abusive episodes, followed by marked immediate amnesia for details of the event. Abusive episodes would be initiated

unexpectedly, rage would be "unleashed" in five to ten minutes (12), and he couldn't "recall much of it even an hour later." Indeed, Peter was particularly struck by his inability to recall the number of abusive episodes, much less the precipitant or other details. This unintentional Nescience was also marked by the experience of blurred vision and thought (25). Peter also reportedly experienced the impulse to engage in intentional Nescience where he felt compelled to deny having a problem with anger and aggression when his wife suggested they seek counselling, as well as the need to avoid addressing the issue by relying on the passage of time to heal damage from abusive episodes.

In the Validation Theme, Peter experienced an extremely compelling impulse to justify himself. Especially during abusive episodes, Peter was aware of the conviction "that she was wrong and it seemed paramount to prove" (1) his "point." Validation was also experienced as a need "to be on the defense" (8), and "to get back at her at all costs" (11). The inescapable "need to do something" (15) ultimately manifested in anger and "lashing out" at Candice. In what may be an extension of Validation, Peter's experience also contained an External-Material Theme, which applies primarily to Peter's general experience of himself during the period in which he was abusive, and not specifically to abusive episodes. This theme is marked by an external focus in which material "things started to take over" (33) in importance, accompanied by the "exclusion" (34) of people close to

him. Hence, Peter experienced obsessive-compulsive impulses regarding appearances, in which material cleanliness, tidiness, and order dominated his consciousness. Accompanying this External-Material focus was the experience of needing to complete material projects quickly and impatience with personal demands from his family.

Validation efforts were accompanied by an Urgency Theme in which Peter experienced a sense of agitated Urgency and the feeling of being rushed. During marital conflicts he felt himself "become very impatient and very fast" (3) when making his point. This "great feeling of impatience" (35), as well as worry about impositions on his own time and being on time, also extended to the "burden" of routine family matters and social events. An associated agitation experienced by Peter is found in an Escape theme. In this theme Peter experienced a sense of restlessness in which he "found it very hard to sit still" (5) during marital disputes, pacing and wandering "from room to room." Escape is further characterized as feeling "cornered" (19) and "claustrophobic" (22) in response to Candice's pressure to talk it out, which eventually precipitated a desperate physical "lashing out" followed by the impulse to "flee" the situation in order to "calm down" (44).

The themes of Nescience, Validation, External-Material, Urgency, and Escape form a second order cluster represented as Preservation. These five themes were judged to share the essential feature of protecting or defending Peter's fragile self and the emotional anguish precipitated by threats to and

reminders of that inadequate self. Hence, through Nescience, as well as the distraction of External-Material and Urgency experiences, Peter maintains a measure of dissociation from the experience of his fragile self and the anguish that accompanies it. Similarly, Validation and Escape experiences more explicitly defended Peter from perceived assaults on his already fragile self and the triggering of anguish.

Paradoxical Control forms the final second order thematic cluster for Peter, which reflects the manner in which feelings of being controlled, out of control, and/or wanting control pervade his experience. This cluster is dominated by a Constraint Theme that contains several distinct dimensions which emerge during abusive episodes. Peter would "feel balled up inside" (4) in helpless "frustration" with his failure to quickly make his "point" with Candice. He felt the uncontrollable and overwhelming physical "feeling of wanting to hurt" (14) in retaliation. As abusive episodes escalated, he experienced a claustrophobic "feeling of being in a small space" (24), and associated with the experience of being pursued by Candice (18).

The paradoxical experiences of being without control and asserting control are also implicated in the Disintegration Despair and Preservation clusters. Anger appears to explode uncontrollably, but serves the instrumental function of seeking control through retaliation. Periodically Anguish bursts uncontrollably into awareness, but appears to be adequately suppressed most of the time. The Fragile Self is experienced to be largely in

the control of external forces; however, his feelings of inferiority and shame, as well as fear of failure and rejection allude to an acceptance of responsibility for his inadequacies. Repudiation is something over which he feels little control, but seeks to control. Similarly, in Nescience amnesia and mental fogging belie absence of conscious control, while denial and avoidance attest to volition in consciousness. In Validation Peter appears to demonstrate a capacity to enact control through justification and retaliation; however, since these impulses are experienced as inescapable, it appears paradoxically not to be volitional. Moreover, the failure of the Validation effort of justification attests to powerlessness in attaining the control he feels impelled to pursue. Finally, an uncontrolled dimension pervades the impulse to flee in the Escape Theme, the impatience and time constraint of the Urgency Theme, and the external focus on "things" in the External-Material Theme.

Summary of Peter's Experience

The three second order thematic clusters (Table 2:1; p. 100) of Disintegration Despair, Preservation, and Paradoxical Control form the essential structure of Peter's experience as a wife abuser. He too was plagued by a haunting Anguish which betrayed a hurt, fearful, inadequate, and Fragile Self buried "deep inside." When touched or provoked by signs of Repudiation, the Anguish of Peter's Fragile self and his fear of abandonment manifested as Anger, as well as vigorous defensive and

retaliatory attempts that escalated to physical abuse. Hence, protective themes mark much of Peter's experience, as he attempted to manage or avoid his Anguish with the justification attempts of Validation, the dissociation of Nescience, the preoccupation of External-Material focus, the impatience of Urgency, and the impulse to Escape. The contradictory impulses of Paradoxical Control are not explicitly described as "control" issues in Peter's protocol; however, the essence of variously feeling controlled, feeling powerless, and seeking control pervade his experience. In the aggregate, therefore, Peter's abuse acts as a dramatic expression and avoidance of the intolerable Anguish issuing from the alarming experience of a profoundly inferior and Fragile Self.

Table 2:0
First Order Thematic Description of Peter's Experience

1. Anger.	Sudden, dramatic, and brief affective arousal that focused on her and demanded expression as revenge. Experienced as precipitated by her, over an insignificant event, and associated with an obscure inner source of anguish and/or fear. Marked by amnesia surrounding the precipitating event, anger and abuse; however, a sequence of anger, rage, revenge, and escape could be recalled. (6,7,23,43)
2. Anguish.	An obscure but powerful inner feeling characterized as fear, threat, betrayal, hurt, and desperation. This feeling periodically overpowers suppression forces, assumes control over him, and demands expression. Precipitated by her actions, and elicits self-protective impulses. (9,10,13,26,44)

3. Fragile Self. Life-long, context dependent low self-worth that manifests significantly in marital and social settings. Characterized as fear of failing, being wrong, rejection, and discovery. Includes the experience of shame after abusive episodes, and the fear of facing people if the relationship dissolved. Reported adequate career self-esteem, and a history of social dependency on her. (27,28,46)

4. Attachment. An initial relationship experience characterized as intense, emotionally open and supportive, equal, and devoid of abusive impulses. These positive attributes were accompanied by an implication of reciprocal dependency. After five years he became increasingly controlling. (29,30,31,32)

5. Repudiation. Fear of marital rejection and demise, that ultimately leads to a fear of being alone and independent. Marked by feelings of neglect and betrayal. Alludes to an awareness of dependency on her. Can precede or follow abusive events. (16,17,40,45)

6. Nescience. Absence of awareness and amnesia surrounding the details of abusive events. Characterized as an absence of thinking and visual blurring, as well as sudden, unexpected, inexplicable onset, rapid escalation and termination. Includes amnesia for triggering events that are otherwise experienced as insignificant. Includes a more intentional nescience of ignoring abusive events, denial of problems, and depending on the passage of time as a problem solving strategy. (2,12,25,41)

7. Validation. The sudden, urgent and desperate compulsion to justify himself or establish his position as correct, that precedes abusive acts. Experienced as a self-centered defensive posture and inescapable need to retaliate for perceived harm to himself. Marked by an overwhelming compulsion to subdue, dominate, and hurt, as well as escape her. The inexorable call to action. (1,8,15,36)

8. External-Material. An obsessive-compulsive focus on order and material appearances to the exclusion of family members. Marked by a sense of urgency surrounding material projects, and impatience with people demands. (33,34,37)

9. Urgency. A general impatience marked by a sense of urgency and feeling rushed. Manifests when trying to make his point in marital conflicts, when dealing with the "burden" of family matters, preparing for social engagements, and undertaking external-material tasks. (3,35,38,39)

10. Escape. An aroused, restless state in which he feels driven to escape the concurrent feelings of being pursued, pressured, and constrained by her. When unable to escape what is characterized as a claustrophobic and ugly situation, he resorts to violence in a desperate attempt to obtain peace. (5,19,20,21,22)

11. Constraint. The experience of feeling controlled, powerless, and pursued. He is overcome by the compulsion to make his point or to retaliate with hurt; yet he feels helpless in his ability to impact her or control himself. Includes a psychic and physical claustrophobic experience of being smothered or trapped by her. Marked by pervasive muscular tension, autonomic arousal, the sensation of inescapable physical restraint, and narrowed attentional focus. (4,18,24,42)

Table 2:1
Second Order Thematic Analysis of Peter's Experience

1. Disintegration Despair:	(1) Anger
	(2) Anguish
	(3) Fragile Self
	(4) Attachment
	(5) Repudiation
2. Preservation:	(6) Nescience
	(7) Validation
	(8) External-Material
	(9) Urgency
	(10) Escape
3. Paradoxical Control:	(11) Constraint
	(Anguish)
	(Fragile Self)
	(Repudiation)
	(Nescience)
	(Validation)
	(Escape)
	(Urgency)
	(External-Material)

Jack's Abuse Experience

Results and Discussion

The first level of thematic analysis is illustrated in Appendix Three, which contains a sample of meaning units from Jack's interview protocol (column 1), paraphrases summarizing corresponding meaning units (column 2), and theme terms (column 3). The nine themes that form this first order cluster are named and defined in table 3:0 (p. 108). Table 3:1 (p. 110) provides a further level of abstraction that clusters the 9 first order themes into a higher order structure composed of three essential themes. In the following synthesis of experience, cited themes are drawn from meaning units identified in Jack's protocol. To understand the process of thematic extraction, the reader is encouraged to refer to Appendix Three which contains samples of the meaning units upon which themes are based. In the synthesis, numbers in brackets refer to examples of meaning units and their respective themes.

Synthesis of Jack's Experience:

The eleven themes from Table 3:0 (p. 108) form a detailed profile of Jack's experience as an abuse perpetrator. Jack's experience contains an Anguish Theme in which marital conflicts and perceptions of rejection precipitated feeling unhappy, hurt, empty, and lost, as well as Anger and the impulse to retaliate by hurting her. The aversive nature of Anguish is revealed by Jack's experience of wanting to retaliate, and to control it, as

well as corresponding experiences of crying impulses, sleeplessness, and loss of appetite.

The significance of Anguish is amplified by its association with an Attachment Theme. In Attachment, Jack recounted the experience of a previous relationship with a woman for whom he "cared" (27) a great deal, and from which he had "never forgotten the hurt" (29) of infidelity. Indeed, Jack experienced the details and pain of that rejection, as well as his wish not "to be hurt again" (28), intrude into his current relationship. In a similar vein, Jack's profile contained a Repudiation Theme, in which he experienced rejection of his affectionate gestures, requests for affection, as well as verbal and physical abuse from Debbie. Moreover, he perceived her to discount his attempts to change and reconciliation efforts.

The three themes of Anguish, Attachment, and Repudiation form the second order cluster, Disintegration Despair. Jack also appears to experience distressing emotional pain that is invoked in the context of his interactions with Debbie. For Jack, this pain was tentatively traced to the lingering hurt and traumatic betrayal of a previous significant attachment. Signs of rejection or disaffirmation by Debbie appear to invoke a confusing complex of Anguish, Anger, and retaliation impulses, the nature and origin of which Jack is only subtly aware of.

Jack's profile also contains a number of themes that appear to function as protective responses to the pain of Disintegration Despair. In his

Nescience Theme, Jack experienced a deficit in immediate consciousness. Indeed, his profile is distinguished by a tendency to delayed awareness and reaction. Jack would not be aware of the significance of a marital event until it "dawned" (32) on him several days later. A that point he would "think about it" (34), perceive an affront, and then confront Debbie.

Associated with Nescience is Jack's Rumination Theme where he manifested a marked tendency to withdraw into thought and deliberate over events in an attempt to understand them and formulate a response. Rumination involved questioning "why" events happened, who was responsible, what he might have done wrong, and whether her treatment of him was warranted. Inherent in Rumination was pervasive vacillation and indecision. Jack was unable to acquire the sought after understanding, determination of justification and responsibility, nor was he able to decide whether to constrain himself or act with retaliation. Rumination was also occasionally experienced as a "neutral space" (15) where he felt himself detach from Debbie to think. Finally, Rumination itself could culminate in an aversive experience from which he felt the compulsion to escape from.

A Validation Theme is also evident in Jack's profile. Validation for Jack is distinguished as an explicit reactive attempt to "protect" (6) himself from perceived injustice, accumulated emotional hurt, and immediate physical assault, by retaliating in kind. Validation includes positive attempts "to feel good" (20), initiate reconciliation, and demonstrate attachment

affection. Finally, in Jack's External-Material Theme, he demonstrated a significant focus on domestic order and cleanliness, which served as a frequent source of marital conflict. In this theme Jack frequently felt the compulsion "to get things done" (16) around the home. This compulsion was accompanied by a desire to see Debbie participate in or take responsibility for domestic chores; however her opposition left him feeling resentful and unjustly treated. It is notable that Jack perceived the household to be a particular "mess" (16) and alluded to discomfort about the judgments of other people.

Nescience, Rumination, Validation, and External-Material themes form the second order cluster of Preservation. The themes included in this cluster were judged to share the essential feature of reacting to or managing the discomfort captured in Disintegration Despair. It is arguable that the dissociative delayed awareness of Nescience permitted Jack to control awareness of the invoked hurt, albeit only temporarily. Similarly, vacillation in Rumination permitted Jack to dissociate from experience, remain indecisive in understanding events, and in doing so, delay and avoid awareness of the origins of his discomfort. Validation is a more explicit reactive attempt to ward off the distress of Disintegration Despair through affirmation of self and retaliation. Finally, the External-Material Theme can be conceived of as an instrumental attempt to distract himself by dwelling on an external target, as well as an attempt to prevent further distress and

to affirm himself.

Jack's profile also revealed a higher order Paradoxical Control cluster (Table 3:1; p. 110). The first of two themes that dominate this cluster is the Constraint Theme, which reflects Jack's contradictory control experiences within himself and in his relationship with Debbie. Jack experienced the impulse of wanting to "communicate" with Debbie that conflicted with the experience of not being able to express himself, as well as the fear that he "might say it wrong" and provoke conflict. Jack felt he "should" and did "want" to communicate, and that it was important for him "to think before" speaking; however, his attempts were thwarted by his uncontrollable tendencies to simply "shut up," or to express himself provocatively, as well as a belief that he didn't "have the right" to express his concerns with Debbie. This internal constraint is accompanied by external constraint implicit in Debbie's "smart remark" responses to his attempts to express himself. Overall, Jack simultaneously experienced the helpless frustration of internal impulses to express himself in a positive fashion, change his behaviors, and influence Debbie; the feeling of being controlled by her and his own negative emotional, verbal, and physical impulses; and yet able to impose some control on those same emotional, verbal, and physical impulses.

Unable to "say something" and tending to "keep it inside" Jack would eventually "blow up" and experience the second important theme in the

Paradoxical Control cluster, Anger. The Anger Theme was characterized as accumulated unexpressed "frustration" (8) that is distinguished more as an impulse to expressive action than an awareness of angry feelings. Hence, Anger is an impulse to actively express frustration, and to use his expression to "nag" (2) or influence Karen in some fashion. Anger experience manifests in a range of expressions from controlled release in the form of nagging and property damage (7), to the severity of physical assault of Karen. A significant feature of Jack's experience of Anger is his preoccupation with controlling it.

Indeed, Jack's Rumination Theme is implicated in Anger and the Paradoxical Control cluster. Through cognitive deliberation he obtains some control over his Anger impulses; however, the vacillation of Rumination also appears to circumvent effective communication and contributes to the suppression of emotional impulses which eventually explode in violence. It is arguable as well that Validation and External-Material themes with their apparent objective of obtaining some control in the face of perceived lack of control warrant inclusion in the Paradoxical Control cluster. The Nescience theme also contains an implicit control dimension, in so far as Nescience serves a control function. Hence, in Paradoxical Control cluster, the common thematic element involves conflicting impulses in which Jack feels in control of himself, out of control of himself, unable to control Debbie, and/or controlled by Debbie.

Summary of Jack's Experience

The essence of Jack's experience as a wife abuser is reflected in the three higher order thematic clusters (Table 3:1; p. 110) of Disintegration Despair, Preservation, and Paradoxical Control. This experience is fundamentally aversive. Within the context of his relationship, he felt the Anguish of emotional pain, loneliness, and confusion precipitated by perceived rejection and disaffirmation of himself, and the reexperiencing of the traumatic demise of Attachment in a previous relationship. Jack experienced restricted conscious awareness and delayed grasp of the meaning and personal significance of Repudiation gestures. In a similar protective action he felt the compulsion to excessive deliberation and vacillation over the meaning of some events and his response options. Ultimately he felt compelled to seek Validation of himself through Angry retaliation and a compulsive external focus on domestic order. Jack's experience was distinguished by the experience of an apparent internal struggle over control.

Table 3:0
First Order Thematic Description of Jack's Experience

1. Anguish.	Emotional pain characterized by feelings of unhappiness, emptiness, hurt, and shame. Accompanied by crying impulses, sleeplessness, loss of appetite, memories of prior attachment experience, and attempts to control the experience. Associated with onset of anger. (11,12,24,26)
2. Attachment.	A previous relationship experience marked by significant attachment, rejection, and anguish. Positive and negative emotional associations from that relationship impinge on the present relationship. (27,28,29,30)
3. Repudiation.	Experience of emotional, affectional, and physical rejection from her. He perceives that she distrusts him, is unresponsive to his efforts to satisfy her, spurns his reconciliation efforts, misinterprets his intentions, disrespects his feelings, withholds caring behaviors, and has a distorted image of him. Moreover, rejection is implicit in her reported verbal and physical abuse of Jack. (9,22,23,25,)
4. Nescience.	A tendency toward delayed awareness and reaction. Unaware of the significance to him of comments or events, at the time they occur. Rather, he becomes aware of the significance at a later date, ruminates over them, and then feels compelled to broach them with her. (31,32,33,24,35,)
5. Rumination.	A tendency to indulge in cognitive deliberation in an attempt to understand what is happening, to understand why she has acted as she has, to determine if her actions are warranted, to determine his responsibility, and to formulate an appropriate response. Sometimes implies a certain degree of self-doubt and conflicting impulses over whether to constrain himself or act. At times rumination is itself an aversive experience which he must escape from. (10,13,15,19)

6. Validation. Attempts made to protect and feel good about himself. Characterized at times in terms of righting perceived injustices, or exacting revenge for perceived harm. Includes positive attempts such as initiating romance; however, most of his efforts are inadequate, and tend to escalate into abuse. With Jack, this is more often and more explicitly a physical, rather than a psychic or existential self-affirmation.
(4,6,20)

7. External-Material. Frequently expressed concern about domestic order and cleanliness, that acts as a source of marital conflict. Characterized by a compulsion to take action by initiating clean up activity, but accompanied by resentment toward her perceived oppositional response.
(5,16,21)

8. Constraint. A complex of control experiences where emotional, verbal, and physical expressions are actively controlled or elude control, as well as the feeling of being controlled by her. Internal self constraint is marked by intentional suppression of emotional expression, attempts to respect her expectations, and cognitive reflection before responding. A sense of helplessness accompanies his perception of being unable to communicate with or influence her, of her power in controlling their relationship, of being unable to change himself, and when suppressed feelings fester and explode. Some indication of controlled release of negative emotion.
(1,3,14,17)

9. Anger. The impulse to express what he characterized as frustration. Ranges from controlled letting go to explosive unleashing of accumulated unexpressed feelings. In its most intense form, anger is accompanied by somatic arousal and followed by exhaustion. Although alluded to as a feeling, anger is more an impulse to expressive action. Marked by internal conflict and great concern over controlling these impulses.
(2,7,8,17)

Table 3:1
Second Order Thematic Abstraction of Jack's Experience

1. Disintegration Despair:	(1) Anguish
	(2) Attachment
	(3) Repudiation
2. Preservation:	(4) Nescience
	(5) Rumination
	(6) Validation.
	(7) External-Material
3. Paradoxical Control:	(8) Constraint
	(9) Anger
	(Nescience)
	(Rumination)
	(Validation)
	(External-Material)

Lawrence's Abuse Experience

Results and Discussion

The first level of thematic analysis is illustrated in Appendix Four, which contains a sample of meaning units from Lawrence's interview protocol (column 1), paraphrases summarizing corresponding meaning units (column 2), and theme terms (column 3). The eleven themes that form this first order cluster are named and defined in table 4:0 (p. 120). Table 4:1 (p. 122) provides a further level of abstraction that clusters the 11 first order themes into a higher order structure composed of three essential themes. In the following synthesis of experience, cited themes are drawn from meaning units identified in Lawrence's protocol. To understand the process of thematic extraction, the reader is encouraged to refer to Appendix Four which contains samples of the meaning units upon which themes are based. In the synthesis, numbers in brackets refer to examples of meaning units and their respective themes.

Synthesis of Lawrence's Experience

Lawrence's profile included an Anger Theme which was distinguished by explicit division into mental and physical dimensions. Anger was experienced foremost as chronic uncontrollable "thoughts" (15) that included "rehearsal" (27) of Anger expression, and letting his mind dwell on perceived betrayal (29). Conversely, Lawrence felt able to control verbal and physical expression of Anger by "holding it all inside" (15). He knew,

however, that under this control was a simmering "pressure keg . . . designed to explode." When expressive control was lost, Lawrence experienced an intense "feeling of rage" (27) marked by overwhelming physical tightening.

Anger was accompanied by an Anguish Theme represented by a number of emotional experiences, as well as the experience of mental deterioration. Lawrence described his relationship as "an emotional roller coaster" (38) marked on the down side by feelings of "loneliness" (32), "despondency and real fear" (38). At times his fear escalated to paranoia experienced as "a very horrible . . . watched, closed feeling" (11), accompanied by an experience of "internal stress" or "tenseness." Of great significance to Lawrence in this theme was his perception that Tina abused him emotionally with "deceit" (8) and disrespect, which left him feeling profoundly "betrayed." Anguish was also reflected in feeling "demoralized" in his attempts to cope with her depression and suicidal inclinations.

An experience of mental deterioration contributes to the Anguish Theme, but also composes a significant dimension of a Substance Abuse Theme. Lawrence's profile included a lengthy history of drug and alcohol abuse that he perceived to have contributed to mental instability and marital dysfunction. At the time of his most severe abusive impulses, Lawrence felt his "mind was coming apart" (4), and that the "delusional or paranoid" (9) effects of alcohol were making him feel "crazy." During the final abusive

event he reported blurred vision and unstable gate. It is of note that Lawrence cited drug induced experiences of auditory and visual hallucinations, as well as paranoia some years before onset of his spousal abuse.

Lawrence provided an account of an early relationship experience that supports the presence of an Attachment Theme that alludes to Anguish, and an illuminating explanation of his Substance Abuse. Lawrence described himself as feeling "very despondent" (35) after being "dumped like a dog" (37) by this "first love." The painful significance of this event may be inferred by his ensuing increase in alcohol abuse and his deliberate pursuit of a "replacement for love" in drugs (37). Lawrence also described an Inferior Self Theme that had its origins in early perceptions of himself as "socially retarded" (34), which persisted in his current situation as "depreciating type thoughts" about his own "worth" (10). Inferior Self is also implicated in his experience of being "made the butt of jokes" (34) while drunk or stoned, and feeling unable to extract himself from that "humiliation." In the recent relationship in which Lawrence had been abusive, Inferior Self is reflected in his feeling "embarrassed" (17) by Tina's inescapable public "humiliation" of him.

Lawrence's sense of an Inferior Self occurred primarily in the context of personal and social relationships, which marks the presence of a modest Dependence Theme. Indeed, he felt "a lack of connectedness" and

"incomplete" (33) in himself if not in a relationship with a woman. It is noteworthy, however, that much of Lawrence's profile is marked by a Repudiation Theme in which relational connectedness was experienced as elusive and unattainable. Repudiation for Lawrence involved the experience of relational distancing that manifested in several forms.

In the most severe form of Repudiation, Lawrence experienced explicit rejection from Tina's disparaging remarks and rude physical gestures, when he attempted to initiate attachment (3). Repudiation also manifested in Lawrence's perception that to Tina he "didn't count" and of being abused "financially, emotionally, physically and . . . spiritually" (19) by her. Of particular significance to Lawrence in this theme was the sense of Tina's "betrayal" (13) of his very strongly held values about honesty, trust, and justice. Repudiation also emerged in the emotional distancing implicit in her reported depression, suicidal tendencies, and the experience of being excluded when Tina abused drugs. Finally, Repudiation emerges in Lawrence's awareness of Tina "dismissing" (26) him prior to him assaulting her.

In the aggregate, the seven themes of Anger, Anguish, Substance Abuse, Attachment, Inferior Self, Dependence, and Repudiation form the second order cluster of Disintegration Despair (Table 4:0; p. 120). This cluster captures Lawrence's experience as he wrestled with the intolerable emotional and mental torment of unstable relational attachment that subtly

amplified the feeling of being a hopelessly lonely, disconnected, incomplete, and inadequate person. These experiences were concurrently inflamed into angry rage by experiences of rejection and betrayal, as well as his own uncontrollable cognitive rehearsal tendency, substance abuse, and most dramatically for Lawrence, an insidious sense of mental deterioration.

Lawrence's profile contains a second higher order cluster of themes that appear to serve a protective function. This cluster is dominated by a Rumination Theme in which Lawrence experienced a recurrent and uncontrollable tendency to engage in obsessive circular thinking. He would compulsively dwell on and justify perceived emergencies of betrayal or injustice (28), as well as retaliation impulses. Rumination included chronic worry about Tina's recurrent mental health emergencies, as well as unsuccessful attempts at problem solving that inevitably cycled "back at the same place worrying about . . . feeling lonely" (32). Indeed, Lawrence characterized this problem solving process as rational thinking which ultimately "cycles into a familiar pattern" (30) returning him "to the same emergency, the feeling of betrayal or the feeling of lack of trust" (31). Lawrence was also aware that he used rumination to control anger and substance abuse effects; however, it also kept him in crisis by escalating the experience of rejection, hurt, and anger. Finally, Rumination included cognitive rehearsal of verbal expression of anger, and ultimately physical assault.

Although not always described explicitly as experience, Rumination was accompanied by a Validation Theme in which Lawrence described self-affirmation and self-protection impulses, often in response to perceived Repudiation. Validation was acted upon constructively in seeking Tina's attention, love, and respect by caring for her physical needs (20). Many Validation impulses were, however, restricted to cognitive rumination that was not followed by action. Validation could descend into "retribution and vengeance" (11) as he sought affirmation and self-justification by convincing himself with a certain haughtiness that he was "on the side of right."

In its most severe form, Validation manifested as a "desperation to end" (4) the feeling of being "trapped" and on the edge of mental disintegration. Desperation did end finally in physical assault. It was within this culminating event, that a Nescience Theme was revealed. In Nescience Lawrence experienced a sudden but brief decline in conscious awareness where "everything clouded in" (23), " got darker," (24) and "glassed over." Although he could recall details of the assault during the interview, his recollection was that the event unfolded very rapidly and outside of consciousness until he became aware of his "hands around her neck" (5). Nescience was also marked by a lack of awareness of the physical harm done to himself as Tina resisted his assault (22). Nescience also contained two paradoxical dimensions. Despite the experience of being unaware of himself, Lawrence had been aware of some physical and auditory sensations

associated with "the struggle" (21). Similarly, even though the assault reportedly unfolded and concluded very quickly, he experienced it as "quite long at the time" (7).

The Substance Abuse Theme also appears to load on this protective cluster. Indeed, Lawrence alluded to the Validation effect of Substance Abuse as a "replacement for love" (37). The effects of Substance Abuse are also implicated in the final Validation act of physical assault, as well as in the numbing and blurring effects of Nescience. Although it must remain speculative at this point, Substance Abuse may simultaneously contribute to and defend against Lawrence's experiences of Anguish and Repudiation.

Indeed, the four themes of Rumination, Validation, Nescience, and Substance abuse form the higher order cluster of Preservation. Together these themes were judged to share the common feature of defending against the painful experiences of Disintegration Despair. For the most part Lawrence appeared to engage in peaceful initiatives at staving off Anguish through his attempts to create positive Attachment experiences, albeit unsuccessfully. He was more successful at internalized Preservation through his Rumination strategies; however, this success was ultimately ineffective, as well as mentally and emotionally costly to him. Once again it is arguable that Substance Abuse effects provided Lawrence with a mechanism to control the chronic threat of Anguish, while Nescience was invoked when Anguish and Repudiation reached a critical threshold.

Infecting the entire profile of Lawrence is the quality of Paradoxical Control, which forms the third higher order cluster. Paradoxical Control is dominated by a Constraint Theme, which is marked by a number of control dimensions. Lawrence felt an external constraint where he "wasn't allowed to" (14) express his negative feelings to Tina for fear that "it might upset her." He also felt helplessly constrained in his ability to impact Tina and create the Attachment conditions that he sought. Nevertheless, Lawrence manifested some control with his "indirect" (16) nonverbal expressions of Anger, as well as in verbalizing his feelings out of earshot (18).

At the same time, Lawrence demonstrated internal constraint in his ability to control his thoughts, for example by telling "her off" (16) in his head. However, Lawrence's experience was also that his "negative thoughts" (39) could get "out of control in a slide," which in the worst case would sent him "hurtling towards an abyss" (39) and violence. Hence, conflicting dimensions of Paradoxical Control extend to the Rumination Theme. In a similar fashion, the Anger Theme contains features of Paradoxical Control in so far as Anger was experienced as uncontrollable angry thoughts. In contrast to this experience of being out of control, Lawrence also experienced the ability to impose a measure of control over expression of those angry thoughts. Finally, a control dimension is implicit in Lawrence's Substance Abuse Theme where he felt decidedly out of control of his alcoholism.

Summary of Lawrence's Experience

The three higher order thematic clusters (Table 4:1; p. 122) of Disintegration Despair, Preservation, and Paradoxical Control capture the essence of Lawrence's experience in abusing his wife. He wrestled with emotional and mental Anguish that was closely aligned with and perhaps indistinguishable from a thought-like Anger. Anger was itself experienced primarily as a thought process without expression. Anguish and Anger manifested in the context of his relationship and appear to have roots in a history of inadequate adult Attachment experiences, as well as the experience of a Fragile Self. Indeed, Validation of a complete and connected self through Attachment pervades Lawrence's experience. Persistent exposure to Repudiation experiences of betrayal, injustice, and rejection appeared to inflame his Anguish and provoked Preservation actions. Preservation was dominated by a torturously cyclical cognitive Rumination that ultimately gave way to an explosion of violent rage. Finally, Lawrence's experience contains dimensions of Paradoxical Control wherein he variously feels controlled, demonstrates the capacity for self-control, or loses control of himself.

Table 4:0
First Order Thematic Description of Lawrence's Experience

1. Anger.	An escalating, explosive pressure or rage, experienced first as an uncontrollable state of mind or thought process. Although he felt some control over the expression of this rage, the associated thoughts could not be contained. Accompanied by somatic symptoms of muscular tension and arousal. Associated with substance abuse, cognitive rumination, and the sense of betrayal. (6,15,27,29)
2. Anguish.	A state of emotional distress marked by feeling deceived, fearful, paranoid, abandoned, lonely, betrayed, desperate, demoralized, as well as a sense of mental disintegration. (8,11,31,32,38)
3. Substance Abuse.	Attribution that his drug and alcohol abuse have contributed to his mental instability and marital dysfunction. Drug and alcohol effects included delusions, paranoia, hallucinations, blurred vision, unstable gate, and inability to follow through on everyday domestic and relational plans. Extensive alcohol effects were implicated in the final significant physical assault. (1,9,25)
4. Attachment.	Anguish precipitated by rejection experience in a significant first adult attachment. Contributes to becoming a substance abuser. (35,37)
5. Fragile Self	A life-long general tendency toward self-doubt and self-depreciation. Accompanied by experience and fear of embarrassment and humiliation. Manifests most significantly with respect to and in personal/social relationships. Aggravated by her repudiation behaviors, substance abuse, and his negative rumination. (10,17,34,36)
6. Dependence.	An awareness of the significance of relational attachment, and how in its absence he feels emotionally and existentially incomplete. (33)

7. Repudiation. The perception and experience of rejection and emotional/relational distancing from her, that precipitates feelings of abandonment, betrayal, and anger. Manifests as perceptions that she was emotionally abusive, deliberately uncommunicative, deceptive, untrustworthy, as well as exploiting, neglecting, and disrespecting him. Includes rejection inherent in perceived lack of responsiveness to his attempts to initiate relational attachment, her suicide threats and attempts, as well as in her unstable mental/emotional states. (3,13,19,26)

8. Rumination. A general predisposition to chronic, circular, and obsessive thinking, the most significant example of which involved prior rehearsal of physical assault. Experienced as a compulsion to engage in rational problem-solving, rational self-justification, worry about her, discovery of betrayal, and to dwell on recurrent emergencies. Obsessive thinking also serves to maintain control over his anger, assaultive impulses, and alcohol effects; however, it often appears to keep him in crisis by inflaming anger, hurt, and rejection. (2,28,30,32)

9. Validation. The self-protective impulse to seek relief from mental deterioration and helplessness, to justify himself by confirming the certainty of his perceptions and actions, as well as to retaliate for perceived betrayal and harm. Characterized as a seeking of her attention, which in its most extreme form, escalates to violence. Includes attempts to win her affection and respect by caring for her needs. Largely a reaction to perceived rejection. (4,11,20,26)

10. Nescience. Partial decline in consciousness preceding and during physical violence. Marked by sudden onset and brief duration, but experienced as a slowing of time. Characterized by a darkened, blurred and restricted visual focus. Intense somatic sensations associated with physical assault impulses, remained as the primary focus of awareness, yet he was unaware of the physical harm inflicted on his own body. (5,21,22,23,24)

11. Constraint. Generally feeling helpless, trapped, and out of control of himself and his relationship. The experience of inability to impact or satisfy her, as well as fully restrain his own thought and affective processes. Although he does manifest some ability to control expressive impulses, once released, they become uncontrollably explosive. Includes the ultimate loss of control in a desperate and irrevocable violent pursuit of resolution. Associated with the helplessness of substance abuse. (14,15,18,39)

Table 4:1
Second Order Thematic Description of Lawrence's Experience

1. Disintegration Despair:	(1) Anger
	(2) Anguish
	(3) Substance Abuse
	(4) Attachment
	(5) Fragile Self
	(6) Dependence
	(7) Repudiation
2. Preservation:	(8) Rumination
	(9) Validation
	(10) Nescience
	(3) Substance Abuse
3. Paradoxical Control:	(11) Constraint
	(Rumination)
	(Anger)
	(Substance Abuse)

Rick's Abuse Experience

Results and Discussion

The first level of thematic analysis is illustrated in Appendix Five, which contains a sample of meaning units from Rick's interview protocol (column 1), paraphrases summarizing corresponding meaning units (column 2), and theme terms (column 3). The eleven themes that form this first order cluster are named and defined in table 5:0 (p. 128). Table 5:1 (p. 129) provides a further level of abstraction that clusters the six first order themes into a higher order structure composed of three essential themes. In the following synthesis of experience, cited themes are drawn from meaning units identified in Rick's protocol. To understand the process of thematic extraction, the reader is encouraged to refer to Appendix Five which contains samples of the meaning units upon which themes are based. In the synthesis, numbers in brackets refer to examples of meaning units and their respective themes.

Synthesis of Rick's Experience

The six themes from Table 5:0 (p. 128) form a detailed profile of Rick's experience as an abuse perpetrator. Rick's profile contained an Anguish Theme marked by the experience of severe emotional "pain" and "hurt" (15, 16, 23), that had on one occasion invoked a feeling that he might lose emotional control and cry (15). Accompanying these feelings was a sense of injustice at having "done nothing wrong." Anguish was

reportedly provoked by his perception of having been emotionally abused and rejected by Cheryl, which reflects a Repudiation Theme. Indeed, Rick's protocol contains an extensive chronicle of perceived Repudiation experiences in which Cheryl denied him affectional, physical, and sexual contact. The rejection and neglect of Repudiation was also inferred in Rick's perception that Cheryl deliberately taunted him by flirting with another man, excluded him from activities with her, refused his help, and explicitly distrusted him.

Associated with both the Anguish and Repudiation themes is a Dependence Theme that underscores the significance of relational attachment as a critical dimension of Rick's existence. Indeed, when Cheryl went away on an extended vacation Rick "felt lost without her" (19) and thoughts of her dominated his "mind" (20). The significance of this Dependence is perhaps highlighted when Rick questioned the value "of living anymore" (18) without his wife and family, upon marital separation. Moreover, Dependence was illustrated in Rick's report that he found himself again becoming preoccupied with the new woman in his life. Although not always explicitly stated, all through the Dependence Theme, and inflamed by Repudiation, are the concurrent experiences of isolation, abandonment, loss, and aloneness.

It is through the interaction of Anguish, Repudiation, and Dependence themes that the higher order cluster of Disintegration Despair is formed

(Table 5:1; p. 129). This cluster reflects the inner experience of emotional pain that accompanied various forms of perceived rejection. In the throes of rejection Rick had the subtle experience of disintegration of relational attachment and dependence: A loss which appeared significant enough to at least briefly threaten his existence when it became more explicit. Hence, the experience of Disintegration Despair is subtle one of painful abandonment, loss, isolation, and aloneness.

Rick's profile also contains an Anger Theme that because of its association with feeling "hurt" (5), places it tentatively in the Disintegration Despair cluster. Indeed, the urge "to get the anger away from" him alludes to unspecified Anguish in this theme. However, Rick's Anger is distinguished by its explicit reactive and expressive nature. Anger was experienced as externally controlled and provoked by Cheryl's ability to "bring out the worst" (4) in him. When triggered, Anger quickly transformed to expressive external action which resulted in property damage and/or self-inflicted physical "harm" (1, 2). A Rumination Theme is also evident in Rick's profile, in which he attempted to understand his situation by mentally questioning and speculating about events. Rumination included thoughts about whether Cheryl was involved sexually with her uncle, as well as deliberation over what actions he should take and what effect they might have. The two themes of Anger and Rumination were judged to constitute responses that serve to appease or manage Disintegration Despair, and

hence form the higher order Preservation Cluster (Table 5:1; p. 129). In Anger, Rick appeared to protect himself by removing or purging the unpleasant experiences of Anguish, Repudiation, and Dependence. It could be inferred as well that Anger served an instrumental function of attempting to invoke a form of coerced relational validation; however, there was little in Rick's experience to support such an interpretation. Rumination was judged to served a similar protective function, albeit more indirectly, of managing the marital/relational uncertainty that appeared to precipitate Disintegration Despair.

The final higher order Paradoxical Control cluster represented in Rick's profile is dominated by a Constraint Theme. In Constraint, Rick manifested the ability to control his own emotional and physical responses, yet at times his Anguish would "build up" (5) as though he was "going to explode," and demanded expression. However, Rick still appeared to retain control of the outward expression of these impulses by directing it toward inanimate targets. The helplessness of Constraint was also revealed in Rick's experience of his relationship with Cheryl as one where there was "just no answer to" her distrust of him. Finally, Rick felt the effects of Constraint in "allowing" thoughts about Cheryl "control (his) life" (20).

It is of note that Constraint extended to other themes in Rick's profile. The pain of Anguish was something precipitated by Repudiation, which he sought to control, but over which he was helplessly unable to control. His

Dependence Theme alludes to an absence of existential control, Anger was something provoked externally yet over which he had some expressive control, and Rumination contains an element of control in the obsessive thinking about Cheryl. Hence, the Paradoxical Control Cluster, represents Rick's inner experience of having control over himself, losing that control, being controlled by Cheryl, and the compulsion to pursue control of various aspects of himself and his relationship.

Summary of Rick's Experience

The essence of Rick's inner experience as a wife abuser is represented by the three higher order thematic clusters (Table 5:1; p. 129) of Disintegration Despair, Preservation, and Paradoxical Control. Accompanying his abusive gestures were painful feelings of aloneness, abandonment and attachment loss, which were precipitated by a pervasive experience of affectional, physical and sexual rejection. Moreover, Rick felt driven by a desperate urge to escape the aversive experience of his Anguish. Angry outbursts quickly displaced the intense pain of immediate Anguish, while his experience of obsessive and speculative thinking respectively fueled and managed subtle warnings of the inner experience of impending Anguish. Pervading Rick's entire inner experience was a subtle and torturous conflict between impulses to control himself and his situation, versus the helpless feelings of being unable to exercise adequate control, and of being controlled externally. Altogether, the analysis of Rick's protocol

alludes to the inner experience of an aversive Anguish from which he felt desperately driven to escape, but painfully frustrated in that endeavor.

Table 5:0
First Order Thematic Description of Rick's Experience

1. Anguish.	Intense emotional pain precipitated by perceptions of marital rejection, emotional abuse, and unjust treatment. Marked by crying impulses, feelings of shame, emotional constraint, rumination, and the urge to retaliate. (5,9,15,16,23)
2. Repudiation.	The experience of affectional, physical, and sexual neglect or rejection from her. Includes experience of rejection perceived in her explicit verbal-emotional abuse, flirting, behavioral taunting, excluding him from activities, refusing his help, and distrust of him. (3,8,11,13,14)
3. Dependence.	The experiences of loss, abandonment, isolation, and aloneness accompanying separation, which underscores an existential-emotional dependence, where relationship is central to his existence. Characterized as a hopeless, helpless, worthlessness and alludes to an inferior or inadequate self without his wife and family. (18,19,21,24)
4. Anger.	A sudden reactive impulse to physical expressive action, experienced as externally invoked/precipitated by her, and directed toward himself or property. Characterized more as a negative reactive action than a state or experience. (1,2,4,5,7)
5. Rumination.	He resorts to speculative thinking in an attempt to understand her actions and his situation. He deliberates over his behavioral options and their effects. Includes speculation about her infidelity, as well as doubts about himself as a father and husband. (10,12,17,23)

6. Constraint. A complex of control experiences in which he variously feels externally controlled, self-controlled, out of control, or helplessly unable to influence her and resolve marital distress.
(5,6,7,20,22)

Table 5:1
Second Order Thematic Description of Rick's Experience

1. Disintegration Despair:	(1) Anguish
	(2) Repudiation
	(3) Dependence
2. Preservation:	(4) Anger
	(5) Rumination
3. Paradoxical Control:	(6) Constraint
	(Anguish)
	(Repudiation)
	(Dependence)
	(Anger)
	(Rumination)

Across-Persons Thematic Analysis

The aggregate abuse experience extracted from the profiles of the five participants is represented by 14 themes summarized in Table 6:0 (p. 140). The distribution of those themes across participants and their designated cluster associations are illustrated in Table 6:1 (p. 142). Albeit with across-person variations in characterization, all five participant experiences contained Anguish, Repudiation, Anger, and Constraint themes. Hence, abuse experiences were consistently marked by the Anguish of aversive emotional pain that was for some participants decidedly powerful and unbearable. Anguish appeared to be most evident and significant for Ian and Peter, while less vigorously expressed for Lawrence and Rick. Similarly, Ian's and Peter's experience of Anguish more explicitly alluded to disintegration of self, while Lawrence added a component of mental disintegration. With Jack, the experience of Anguish was less explicitly articulated and required greater interpretive license. Indeed, Jack's feeling vocabulary was decidedly deficient and relied heavily on the term "frustration" to express several feeling states, one of which was judged to be Anguish. For all participants Anguish was inflamed by Repudiation which manifested as the experience of neglect and/or rejection from their respective wives. Repudiation was experienced explicitly or as the threat of emotional/affectional distancing, disaffirmation of self, and/or threat of abandonment.

While all five participant experiences contained an Anger Theme, they did vary in the manner in which it manifested. For Ian and Peter, the two perpetrators of severe abuse, Anger was a powerfully overwhelming and uncontrollable experience that was often indistinguishable from the hurt and fear of Anguish, and from which they sought escape. It is informative to note as well that Rick, who reportedly had not physically assaulted his wife, also characterized Anger as "hurt" and undertook to physically get it way from himself. Although the impulse to retaliate marked all participant Anger experiences, for Rick and Jack, Anger was distinguished more as an impulse to expressive action than the experience of being seized by an aversive feeling. Finally, Lawrence added to the Anger theme a cognitive or thought dimension not as evident in other protocols.

The last theme shared by all participants was that of Constraint, which was marked by conflicting control impulses and perceptions. That is, all participants had the experience of being helplessly out of control of their own thoughts, feelings, and/or behaviors, as well as feeling controlled by their wives. Yet all participants also experienced the inescapable impulse to vigorously seek control over themselves and their wives, and indeed experienced periodic yet fleeting success at this. It is noteworthy that the, perhaps torturous, contradictory impulses of control contained in the Constraint theme appeared to spread throughout the overall experience of participants and is implicated in many other themes.

Several themes were shared by all participants but one. Attachment, Validation, and Nescience themes were represented in the profiles of Ian, Peter, Jack, and Lawrence, but not Rick. In Attachment, accounts were given of significant relationship or love experiences. Once again it is notable that the two men who had abused most severely, recounted very intense and positive attachment experiences early in their marriage to the wives whom they had abused, and which dissipated as the marriage continued. Jack also shared a past significant attachment experience that ended with him feeling deeply hurt, a hurt that reportedly impinged on his attachment experience with the woman he abused. Finally, Lawrence alluded to the significant experience of being rejected by his "first love" which evidently contributed to his alcohol and drug abuse. Rick, on the other hand, shared that although he loved his wife, their marriage had been one of convenience and lacked a history of significant attachment experience.

All participants except Rick also experienced a Validation Theme in which they felt the impulse to act to obtain affirmation of themselves from their wives, or otherwise protect themselves from the pain of Anguish. This self affirmation and protection need was most explicitly evident in the experiences of Ian and Lawrence; however, Peter and Jack also appeared to be driven by the same impulse, albeit in different manifestations. Validation was also experienced as an urge to retaliate or seek revenge for Peter, Jack, and Lawrence. Although it could be inferred from other themes in Rick's

protocol that he perhaps should have or could have experienced Validation impulses, there was a distinct absence of significant comments or actions that would permit such an interpretation.

The final theme shared by the four men Ian, Peter, Jack, and Lawrence was that of Nescience, which is most simply characterized as a deficiency or lapse in conscious awareness surrounding incidents of abuse. In particular, Ian and Jack experienced the emotions and behaviors of abusive episodes to emerge suddenly and unexpectedly, and especially for Peter, followed by amnesia. Jack's Nescience experience was distinguished as a deficit in consciousness before abusive episodes, in a kind of delayed awareness. Nescience was also characterized as a compression of time passage, with rapid unfolding of abusive events. Paradoxically, Nescience also involved post-abuse intentional numbing of awareness, especially for Ian and Peter, as well as a simultaneous awareness of some physical sensations during abuse. It remains that the rapid unfolding of Rick's Anger expressions could allude to the presence of Nescience; however, in the absence of adequate reference to this experience such an interpretation was judged indefensible. It is notable as well that several participants made particular note of and reported feeling quite perplexed by the experience of Nescience. It may be pertinent to note that the one participant who did not experience Attachment, Validation, or Nescience is the one who reportedly had not succumbed to direct physical aggression against his wife.

The last theme upon which there was agreement between four participants was that of Rumination; however, in this case it was Peter's profile that lacked indication of this experience. Ian, Jack, Lawrence, and Rick all provided reports that support experience of resorting to vigorous thinking to acquire an understanding of provoking events in the relationship, to invoke some control over internal mental/emotional processes, to justify perceptions and behaviors, and/or to problem solve relational distress. The process of thinking was most significant in the experiences of Jack and Lawrence; however, for both men it had the paradoxical effect of escalating negative responses to relational distress. Indeed, Jack's attempts to understand in order to formulate an appropriate response resulted in indecision, which in turn aggravated the aversive experience of relational distress. Similarly, Lawrence experienced obsessive circular thinking and rehearsal that contributed to his sense of mental deterioration and ultimately resulted in physical assault against his wife. It remains that Peter may have experienced Rumination impulses; however, his protocol did not contain indicators that it was a particularly significant component of his experience.

Evidence was observed for a Fragile Self Theme in which Ian, Peter, and Lawrence experienced a sense of an inadequate or inferior self. This is revealed for Ian in his experience of resolving his abusive tendencies through the experience of self acceptance. Admittedly the post hoc, explanatory nature of this evidence makes the inference of Ian's Fragile Self unreliable;

however, it is arguable that the more reliable evidence of Dependency cited below adequately supports the presence of a Fragile Self experience. Similarly, Lawrence revealed that he had thoughts about and experiences of himself as an inadequate person, especially in relational terms, which were supported by evidence of a Dependence theme. Peter's experience of a Fragile Self was much more explicitly evident in his life long feelings of relational and social inadequacy. Moreover, his fear of failing, rejection, and discovery allude to the experience of diminished self-worth.

The three protocols of Ian, Lawrence, and Rick revealed Dependence themes in which their existential and emotional survival was experienced as dependent on or incomplete without a relationship. For Ian this was a very critical Dependence, which when threatened or unfulfilled was profoundly distressing. Lawrence and Rick also experienced unfulfilled Dependence as distressing, albeit apparently less severely. Dependence was implied in Peter's reported social dependency on his wife, and could be inferred from evidence inherent in other themes. Insufficient evidence was available, however, to permit the inclusion of a specific Dependence theme for either Peter or Jack.

The last shared experience was represented in the External-Material theme. In this theme Ian, Peter, and Jack manifested the experience of focusing almost obsessively on material and social accomplishments. Ostensibly this focus was accompanied by feelings of inadequacy and

success in accomplishments invoked feelings of adequacy. For all three men, External-Material experiences involved a compulsion to take action on material projects and to deemphasize interpersonal involvement. The focus of Peter and Jack was typically on domestic order, tidiness, and cleanliness, and accompanied by the feeling of needing to get things done. Peter in particular felt the compulsion to get things done very quickly. It is notable that both Lawrence and Rick offered comments that suggest a modest External-Material focus. Lawrence expressed concern about social appearances after he had assaulted his wife, and Rick reported that during an earlier phase of his marriage that neglected his family and wife in favour of his business. However, it was judged that these two accounts did not warrant characterization as significant dimensions of their respective abuse experiences.

The two themes of Urgency and Escape were observed exclusively in Peter's profile. Although Urgency was implied in some of the other participant experiences, it appeared most saliently in Peter's. Urgency reflects Peter's experience of feeling generally impatient and rushed, that also manifested during abusive episodes. Escape reflects his experience of feeling aroused, restless, pursued, and constrained, accompanied by the desperate impulse to get away from those feelings. Escape and Urgency themes were not explicitly evident in the other four participant profiles; however, the presence of a Validation theme for virtually all participants

alludes to a similar experience of desperately needing to obtain relief from emotional distress. Indeed, Escape and Urgency may allude to the significance of the distress experienced by all five participants, which is evident in their respective attempts to manage experiences of Anguish and Repudiation.

Finally, Lawrence was the sole participant who's experience included a Substance Abuse theme. Lawrence attributed much of the responsibility for his abusive behavior to his use of drugs and alcohol. Indeed, the mental instability induced by drug and alcohol abuse marked the frustrating and conflictual experience of Lawrence had of his relationship with Tina. When this conflict finally escalated to violence, Lawrence experienced substantive alcohol effects. It is notable that Rick reported that his wife accused him of abusing alcohol; however, he denied this accusation and insisted that alcohol was not a factor in his abusive behaviors.

Across-Persons Higher Order Cluster Analysis

The essence of the abuse experience of the five participants is represented in the three higher order clusters of Disintegration Despair, Preservation, and Paradoxical Control. All participants manifested the essential experience captured by these clusters, albeit with slight variations in the specific content (see Table 6:1; p. 142). Anguish and Repudiation themes contribute to the Disintegration Despair cluster for all five participants. For three participants (i.e. Ian, Peter, and Lawrence), themes

of Anger, Fragile Self, and Attachment add to Anguish and Repudiation in defining Disintegration Despair. The Dependence theme contributes to the experience of Disintegration Despair for three participants (i.e. Ian, Lawrence, and Rick); while Validation and Substance Abuse contribute to that experience for Peter and Lawrence respectively. Jack was unique in the representation of his experience of Disintegration Despair by the three themes of Anguish, Repudiation, and Attachment.

Complete agreement is not obtained on any theme for the Preservation Cluster (see Table 6:1; p. 142). Contributions to Preservation from four participants were observed for the Validation Theme (Ian, Peter, Jack, and Lawrence), the Nescience Theme (Ian, Peter, Jack, and Lawrence), and the Rumination Theme (Ian, Jack, Lawrence, and Rick); while three participant profiles contributed the External-Material Theme (Ian, Peter, and Jack). The Urgency and Escape Themes complete the Preservation Cluster for Peter, while the Substance Abuse Theme completes it for Lawrence. Finaily, the Paradoxical Control Cluster is dominated by the Constraint Theme in all five participants; however, a variety of themes that also loaded on Disintegration Despair and Preservation also contribute to this cluster.

The Essence of Men's Abuse Experiences

The essence of the experience of these five men spanned the duration of their marriages and was highlighted in specific abusive episodes. This

experience was delineated first by sometimes intense and haunting feelings of emotional pain (Anguish) that accompanied feelings of relational neglect and rejection (Repudiation), and which appeared for some to tap deeper aversive experiences of existential, emotional, and mental inadequacy and/or disintegration (Fragile Self & Dependence). Within the hopelessness of threatened disintegration, these men appeared to experience a subtle certainty that survival of self and relief from Anguish could be secured through spousal affirmation. Indeed, four participants had experienced affirmation of self through relationship (Attachment). Such affirming experiences had, however, become elusive and when most strikingly absent invoked the most severe Anguish that was experienced as Anger and violent impulses.

Throughout their histories of abuse, these five men experienced unremitting self-protective and self-affirming impulses (Anger, Validation, Nescience, Rumination, Substance Abuse & External-Material) to restore integration of self or otherwise remove the experience of Disintegration Despair. It is within these experiences that the phenomenon of abusive behavior manifested most explicitly. Finally, all five men experienced the paradoxical experience of feeling helplessly out of control of themselves, feeling controlled by their wives, the inescapable impulse to obtain control themselves and their wives, and indeed the experience of having some of that control.

Table 6:0
Summary and Synthesis of Abuse Themes

1. Anguish:	Aversive emotional pain that was for some participants decidedly powerful and unbearable.
2. Repudiation:	The experience of neglect and/or rejection from their respective wives in the form of emotional/affectional distancing, disaffirmation of self, and/or threat of abandonment.
3. Anger:	The experience of being seized by an aversive emotional state, often indistinguishable from the pain of Anguish, and which invoked impulses to escape the feeling as well as to expressive action.
4. Constraint:	The contradictory impulses and feelings of being controlled, being out of control, wanting control, and periodically succeeding at control of thoughts, feelings, behaviors, and wives.
5. Attachment:	The experience of having positively and intensely attached to a woman in the past. For all participants this experience had ended in some fashion.
6. Validation:	The experienced impulse to act to seek self-affirmation and/or self-protection from the pain of anguish. Also experienced as the urge to retaliate or seek revenge.
7. Nescience:	The perplexing experience of deficiency in conscious awareness surrounding incidents of abuse. Events unfolded suddenly, unexpectedly, quickly, followed by some amnesia, or were preceded by delayed awareness of an affront. Included post-abuse intentional numbing of awareness and paradoxical awareness of certain somatic sensations.
8. Rumination:	The experience of vigorous, sometimes circular, rational thinking to acquire an understanding of provoking events in the relationship, to invoke some control over internal mental/emotional processes, to justify perceptions and behaviors, and/or to problem solve relational distress. It could have the paradoxical effect of escalating negative

responses to relational distress.

9. Fragile Self: The enduring experience of an inadequate or inferior self, most notably in relational and social terms.

10. Dependence: The experience that existential and emotional survival was dependent on or incomplete without a relationship. Essentially a negative experience provoked by Repudiation and experienced as death, incompleteness, abandonment, and aloneness.

11. External-Material: The experience of compulsively focusing on material and social accomplishments, ostensibly to ward off concurrent inadequate self feelings. This included a compulsion to take action on material projects to the exclusion of interpersonal involvement, as well as a specific focus on domestic order.

12. Urgency: The experience of impatience and of feeling rushed.

13. Escape: The restless experience of needing to escape feelings of being pursued, pressured, and constrained.

14. Substance Abuse: The experience of drug and alcohol effects such as delusions, paranoia, hallucinations, blurred vision, etc. across Lawrence's adulthood and specifically during assault.

Table 6:1
Distribution of Themes and Clusters

IAN	PETER	JACK	LAWRENCE	RICK
Anguish (DD)	Anguish (DD)	Anguish (DD)	Anguish (DD)	Anguish (DD)
Repudiation (DD)	Repudiation (DD)	Repudiation (DD)	Repudiation (DD)	Repudiation (DD)
Anger (DD)	Anger (DD)	Anger (DD)	Anger (DD)	Anger (DD)
Fragile (DD) Self	Fragile (DD) Self		Fragile (DD) Self	
Attachment (DD)	Attachment (DD)	Attachment (DD)	Attachment (DD)	
Dependence (DD)			Dependence (DD)	Dependence (DD)
			Substance (DD) Abuse (PR)	
Validation (PR)	Validation (PR)	Validation (PR)	Validation (PR)	
Nescience (PR)	Nescience (PR)	Nescience (PR)	Nescience (PR)	
Rumination (PR)		Rumination (PR)	Rumination (PR)	Rumination (PR)
External- (PR) Material	External- (PR) Material		External- (PR) Material	
	Urgency (PR)			
	Escape (PR)			
Constraint (PC)	Constraint (PC)	Constraint (PC)	Constraint (PC)	Constraint (PC)

Note: Disintegration Despair = (DD), Preservation = (PR), Paradoxical Control = (PC)

Strengths and Limitations of the Study

Sampling

In view of the self-selecting nature of the sample used in this study, caution is warranted in interpreting results. Certainly this sample may represent a very distinct subgroup of male perpetrators of intimate partner abuse, who were able for some reason to overcome the embarrassment of admitting to and talking about their abusive behavior. Phenomenological methodology does not presume, however, to permit empirical generalization of findings. Therefore, to dwell on the possibility that the essential structure obtained may represent the unique experience of a biased sample is a moot point. What is important, however, is that these five participants were able to meet the phenomenological research standard of sufficiently manifesting the structure and meaning of the experience (Collaizzi, 1978; Wertz, 1984). Indeed, a particular strength of the study is that on the whole, participants reflective ability was conducive to articulating the experience of intimate partner abuse.

The variability in severity, frequency, and specific nature of abusive behaviors makes this appear to be a very heterogeneous sample. Nevertheless all participants presented themselves as having been abusive, and their behaviors did meet the broader definition of intimate partner abuse. Moreover, it is arguably a particular strength of this study that the sample provides a broad range of intimate partner abuse that provides useful

contrast of variability in the phenomenon.

The five year period of remission for the participant called Ian warrants some concern regarding his ability to accurately recall experience. Ian, however, provided very rich experiential data. It is notable that he had been engaged in counselling throughout that period which may have kept the experience fresh. Similarly, the participant named Peter, whose abuse had been in remission for one and one half years provided particularly rich experiential data. It is possible that the experience of counselling has biased these men in the direction of the articulated experience; however, it is equally possible that counselling opened these men up to permit greater awareness of themselves and their experience.

Reliability

In quantitative methodology the concept of reliability is concerned with the issue of measurement consistency, stability, and repeatability (Wertz, 1986). More specifically the quantitative notion of reliability refers to the degree to which measurement accuracy is compromised by sources of error, especially that which accrues from observer subjective bias. Hence, quantitative research attempts to minimize error in order to claim reliability of measurement strategies and exclusion of observer or respondent subjective bias. In contrast, the "perspectival" approach of qualitative phenomenological methodology celebrates the "error" inherent in the multiplicity of subjective perspective. Indeed, Wertz asserts that the

reliability of qualitative phenomenological research should be concluded based on the "persistence of meaning through the factual variations" of perceived experiences.

In the present study, therefore, reliability is asserted in so far as discrepancies in the experiences of participants contribute to a fuller articulation of the essential structure of the phenomenon that includes multiple subjective perspectives. Rather than considering the variability of experience and themes across participants as errors of instability and inconsistency, qualitative phenomenological methodology permits us to consider the contribution of these discrepancies to a shared meaning as testimony to the reliable apprehension of the essential meaning of the phenomenon. In discussing the trustworthiness sought in reliability, Wertz (1986) speaks of being able to "look again and again and see the same thing." In the present study it is arguable that through the variability of experience revealed by participants, the essential meaning of the experience can be seen again and again.

Validity

A significant threat to reliability and validity lies in the risk that in thematic analysis the data will be "read like the devil reads the Bible" (Kvale, 1983). The question of validity in this study is most concerned with whether the thematic analysis, and resulting essential structure articulated, accurately represents the experience and meaning of intimate partner abuse

to these five men. In other words, do the second order thematic clusters of Disintegration Despair, Preservation, and Paradoxical Control truly reflect the meaning and experience of these men?

Unlike quantitative research, the nature of phenomenological methodology limits the degree to which this study can be claimed to be reliable and valid. Comments about two of the four validity checks in phenomenological research (Osborne, 1990) can be made, however. First, three participants who participated in the follow-up interview agreed with the experience and meaning represented in the three second order clusters of Disintegration Despair, Preservation, and Paradoxical Control. Generally agreement was found for the defining themes of these clusters, and no significant objections were raised. For logistic reasons validation of thematic analysis was not obtained from two participants. Second, it is arguable that concurrent validity is obtained from the previously reviewed research on Borderline Personality Organization and Interpersonal Attachment in intimate partner abuse, which appear to reflect similar themes (see General Discussion for elaboration). More explicit validation of this sort would come from other phenomenological analyses or other sources of information about experience of men who perpetrate intimate partner abuse.

The third measure of validity in phenomenological research (Osborne, 1990) requires external examination of the degree to which the methodology used and "bracketing" support or undermine the validity of results.

Similarly, the "juridical process" (Osborne, 1990) in which I have deliberately and carefully presented the results in a manner intended to convince readers of the validity of the analysis remains to be judged by those readers.

CHAPTER SIX

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Introduction

In keeping with the principles of phenomenological research, there may be little more to add to the previous Results and Discussion section. Presuming that the essential structure of the experience of intimate partner abuse has been accurately captured, the task of illuminating the lived experience of this phenomenon has been accomplished. The value of this accomplishment in expanding our understanding of intimate partner abuse remains to be assessed. The literature on phenomenological methodology is somewhat vague and contradictory regarding what should be done with results of a phenomenological study. It is generally asserted that phenomenological methodology is not intended to, nor justified in, making causal predictions or empirical generalizations (Van Manen, 1990, p. 21-24; Polkinghorne, 1983; Valle, & King, 1978). However, Polkinghorne (1983) and Wertz (1984) suggest that the implications of phenomenological findings for theory should be discussed. In keeping with this advice, the following General Discussion will explore application of the present findings to current theory and research in intimate partner abuse. This discussion is not intended to imply replication or validation of theory or research. Rather, it is undertaken with the intent of increasing our understanding of this phenomenon by adding the dimension of the essential lived experience of

men who perpetrate intimate partner abuse. Any illumination of understanding of intimate partner abuse based on the descriptive findings provided in the present investigation, would require further study in the direction indicated.

Implications for Sociological Models

In view of the intrapsychic focus of phenomenological analysis and the general exclusion of psychological determinants in Sociological models, it is perhaps not surprising that results of the present study do not greatly illuminate the defining features of Family Violence and Feminist models of intimate partner abuse. Little can be inferred from the experience of these men that would attest to the role of family structure or violent family subculture in the experience of perpetrating intimate partner abuse. Family structure themes of physical proximity, decision making, distribution of power, and individual differences in the family were not reflected in this analysis. Peter and Jack made reference to the stress of domestic affairs which suggests family structure determinants; however, the External-Material theme to which these comments contribute manifested more as Preservation of a Fragile Self. The protection from social censure through the "privacy" of the family was alluded to by the awareness of Ian and Peter that public disclosure of their abuse would be costly; however, here too the focus of this cost was more to the Fragile Self.

In keeping with the Family Violence model, participant protocols

suggest the presence of conflict prone relationships, especially for Jack and Lawrence. To the outside observer the prevalence of comments and behaviors associated with Anger, Repudiation, and Validation themes would appear on the surface to reflect conflict ridden relationships. However, phenomenological analysis reveals that the essence of these three themes attests more to the Anguish of existential instability of a Fragile Self than to the practical domain of interpersonal power conflicts and social exchange of a violent family subculture.

The operation of social exchange and pursuit of reward indicated in Sociological models appear to be present in the Preservation cluster, represented most significantly by the Validation theme. Removal of the aversive experience of Disintegration Despair, especially when faced with Repudiation experiences, would most surely be reinforcing of abusive initiatives. It is notable, however, that the reward sought under the principles of social exchange is commonly conceived as a reward of power or advantage, such as having one's decision prevail in a conflict. Based on the present thematic analysis, it is difficult to conceive of the reinforcing effects of Preservation incentive in terms of the power advantage suggested by social exchange principles. Moreover, the presence of Nescience, Rumination, Urgency, and External-Material themes in the Preservation cluster, some of which are not directed at the spouse and can occur in her absence, suggest that this experience is not indicative of pursuit of reward

power as articulated in Sociological models. Rather, it appears to be related more to the Anguish inherent in perceived threat to affective attachment and dissolution of a Fragile Self reflected in the Repudiation theme.

On the surface, it would also appear that the power variable contained in Sociological models is reflected in the second order cluster of Paradoxical Control, particularly in the critical defining theme of Constraint, supported by Validation. Indeed it would appear that men in this sample experience a struggle against disempowerment inherent in a relationship power differential that favours their wives. On the surface this would appear to correspond to Feminist assertions that as women gain power and challenge the patriarchal advantage, men will resort to the "ultimate resource" of violence to regain that advantage. However, the power advantage held by female partners in this study was experienced by these men not in patriarchal terms of economic, social, or political power, but of existential power. Hence, what appears at first glance to be use of control to maintain a power advantage, in phenomenological terms presents more as a desperate defensive attempt to simply maintain the existence of a Fragile Self.

In contrast to what Sociological models predict, the experience of these five men did not reveal pervasive attitudes approving of violence against female intimate partners. Nor was there a pervasive appeal to social sanction of such violence, or to patriarchal right to dominate intimate partners. Only Ian's protocol revealed a defensive experience of appealing,

in his own mind, to Biblical sanction of husband domination and abuse of his wife; however, thematic analysis revealed that this justification was but one variable of a Preservation cluster in which he experienced the need to protect his Fragile Self. Moreover, Ian's experience of "guilt" surrounding his abuse attests to self-doubts about the legitimacy of his actions. It is notable as well that within the parameters of the thematic analysis the essential experience of these five men does not cast blame on women, the relationship or society. Certainly through the experiences of Repudiation and Validation these men focus on their intimate partners as causal agents; however, a full analysis of the essential structure of the phenomenon suggests that the woman is indeed an innocent bystander in this affair. This analysis suggests that the experience and behavior of these men is associated more directly with the presence of fragile selves than with contextual determinants such as socialization or the actions of their intimate partners.

Finally, this thematic analysis reflects specific observations from research associated with Sociological models. As revealed in all but Ian's protocol, especially within the Repudiation theme, these men did not experience their wives as stereotypically "compliant" women, which was also observed by Cordova, Jacobson, Gottman, Rushe, and Cox (1993). Indeed, within the Repudiation theme Peter, Jack, Lawrence, and Rick appear to experience their wives as engaging in escalation tactics similar to

that observed by Margolin, John, and Gleberman (1988). Within the parameters of Validation and Repudiation themes, there also appears to be experience of the husband demand, wife withdrawal tactic reported in abusive relationships (Babcock, Waltz, Jacobson, & Gottman, 1993). Similarly, in keeping with the Feminist focus on power, the combined experience of Repudiation, Validation and Dependence themes alludes to the previously observed relationship between intimate partner abuse and the woman's "reward power" (Claes & Rosenthal, 1990). Once again, the present analysis suggests that this reward power operates more in the service of Preservation of a Fragile Self than in preservation of patriarchal status or as social exchange.

Implications for Intergenerational Transmission

In view of the focus of the present study on the experience of perpetrating intimate partner abuse, the thematic analysis undertaken is not informative regarding the role of intergenerational transmission effects. It is of note, however, that during interviews each participant did provide descriptions of family of origin environment. The two men who perpetrated the most severe physical abuse toward their spouse, Ian and Peter, both experienced severe childhood physical abuse from their fathers; however, the other three participants did not report exposure to family of origin abuse.

It is perhaps noteworthy that the three participants not exposed to family of origin violence did describe experiences reminiscent of other

mediating factors observed in intergenerational transmission research. In keeping with the Caesar (1988) observation that abusive men not exposed to family of origin violence are more likely to have experienced severe discipline, Jack provided a report of having experienced severe physical discipline and "strict" parenting from his mother. Moreover, the observation that childhood neglect and rejection predict adult aggression (Widom, 1989; Rivera & Widom, 1990), is implied in reports of childhood experiences of rejection and/or neglect by all three men not exposed to family of origin violence. Both Jack and Lawrence experienced parental rejection, especially by their fathers, and Adam described experiences of childhood parental emotional neglect.

Implications for the Personality/Typology Approach

The present thematic analysis is not informative regarding Family-Only or Generally abusive topologies. Although not part of the thematic analysis, participant self-reports at the time of the interview suggest that all five men perpetrated less severe forms of abuse exclusively against their intimate partners, which suggests Family-Only typology. However, in the absence of a reliable measure of severity of intimate partner abuse in this study, as well as the reported unreliability of men's reports of abuse perpetration (Arias & Beach, 1987; Dutton & Hemphill, 1992; Langhinrichsen-Rohling & Vivian, 1994; Saunders, 1991), classification of this sample as Family-Only is speculative at best. Characteristics of both typologies were reflected in the

thematic analysis, such as low self-esteem (Fragile Self), affective numbing and detachment from feelings (Nescience), fear of abandonment (Dependence and Repudiation), and difficulty with anger (Anger). These do not, however, cluster into a specific typology.

The phenomenological thematic analysis undertaken in this study resembles the clustering of symptom phenomenology used in the diagnosis of psychopathology and personality disorders (American Psychiatric Association, 1987). Themes drawn from this analysis correspond to defining characteristics of the range of personality disorders identified in personality research on intimate partner abuse. Indeed, all of the thematic clusters, and virtually all of the discrete themes (see Table 6:0) arguably correspond to or resemble defining features of personality disorders. This observation alone suggests that the experiences of men in this sample may resemble experiences typically considered pathological in clinical settings. Moreover, it is important to note that these personality features appear to manifest most sharply in the experience of these men in intimate relationship. In summary, without reference to specific personality disorders or factor analytic clusters, personality disorder features and corresponding themes include: labile and uncontrollable affect (Anger and Constraint); low self-esteem, shyness, social discomfort, and disturbed and unstable identity (Fragile Self); attention seeking (Validation); anxiousness and hypersensitivity to evaluation and misinterpretation of threat (Repudiation);

unstable dependent relationships (Dependence); internal conflict and tension, with a sense of defeat and helplessness (Anguish); inflexible perfectionism (External-Material); and Substance Abuse.

The results of present thematic analysis most closely resemble Borderline Personality Organization/Disorder. Indeed, the primary defining feature of Borderline Personality is that of identity diffusion or unstable self, which is reminiscent of the Disintegration Despair cluster that pervades the experience of all five participants. This cluster is dominated by Anguish associated with a Fragile Self enmeshed in Dependence with the intimate partner, and ever threatened by Repudiation in relationship. As previously noted, Dutton (1994b) and Dutton and Starzomski (1993) expand on the "fragile selfhood" of the Borderline Personality which is marked by experiences of "chronic emptiness," "masked dependency," the inability to be alone, and "abandonment panic" in response to distancing cues from the intimate partner, all of which are reminiscent of the experience of the Disintegration Despair cluster.

It is arguable as well that the Preservation cluster dominated by Validation and Nescience themes is in keeping with the attention seeking, manipulative, angry, and demanding characterization of Borderline Personality Organization/Disorder (American Psychiatric Association, 1987; Dutton, 1994b; Dutton & Starzomski, 1993). Moreover, the Borderline's tendency to resist disintegration of self with dissociative defenses is

reminiscent of the Nescience theme. Finally, the Paradoxical Control cluster is arguably reminiscent of the "dysphoric stalemate" observed in Borderline Personality Organization where the onerous demands of the Fragile Self on the intimate relationship are not fulfilled and the Borderline man struggles with the conflicting forces of desperate need for Validation while facing the Constraint of a relationship unable to deliver. This thematic analysis does not, however, fully reflect a diagnosis of Borderline Personality Disorder (American Psychiatric Association, 1987). The defining feature in this diagnosis of frequent intense relationships is not revealed in the experience or demographic features of participants. Indeed, three of the participants reported lengthy committed relationships.

Finally, it is notable that the present analysis does not reveal thematic organization that corresponds specifically to Antisocial Personality traits. It is important to recall that in typology and personality research that "criminal" personality features, usually associated with the Generally abusive typology, are often found among men who abuse their intimate partners (see Chapter 3). Overall, criminality does not characterize this sample. Only Jack indicated a history of such activity.

Implications For The Interpersonal Attachment Approach

The results of the present thematic analysis appear to reflect an Interpersonal Attachment approach to understanding intimate partner abuse (see Bowlby, 1988, pp. 77-97; Dutton, Saunders, Starzomski, &

Bartholomew, 1994). The second order cluster of Disintegration Despair in the experience of participants, arguably corresponds to the Attachment Anxiety/Anger postulated in the Interpersonal Attachment approach. The dominant role that Disintegration Despair appeared to play in the experience of these men suggests that Attachment Anxiety may be especially intense for men who abuse their intimate partners. The prevalence of an unbearable Anguish theme, accompanied by Fragile Self and Dependence themes which emphasize the relational nature and seriousness of this emotional pain, more clearly defines the experience as markedly disconcerting Attachment Anxiety. Reference to the experience of "fear" as part of the Anger theme that contributes to Disintegration Despair for some participants further suggests that the experience in question is Attachment "Anxiety" more than of Anger. The fact that Disintegration Despair occurs in the context of a Repudiation theme in which the availability of the intimate partner as attachment figure is threatened, appears to further suggest the "Attachment" dimension of Attachment Anxiety.

It is notable at this point that the subtle nature of Anguish, supported by the Nescience theme in the experience of these men may be similar to Bowlby's (1980, pp. 38-43) mechanism of "selective exclusion" in which information most damaging to self is filtered out. It is significant as well to note that some awareness of Anguish and Fragile Self did seep through as Bowlby predicted with "partial" disengagement of the attachment system.

We could speculate, therefore, that the degree of partial or complete detachment of the attachment system may provide some explanation for differences in experience and presentation of the heterogeneous population of men who abuse their intimate partners. For example, we may yet find that abusive men who would meet the criteria for Antisocial Personality or Generally abusive men, with their greater affective numbing, exploitiveness, and dishonesty, may possess more fully disengaged attachment systems.

The experience represented by the Preservation cluster in the present study appears similar to the "protest" or "attachment" behavior articulated by Attachment theory. Spearheaded by the Validation theme, and supported primarily by Nescience and Rumination, as well as other themes, the experience of Preservation appears to reflect the pursuit of a "sense of security" (Bowlby, 1980, pp. 38-43). Indeed, the Validation theme characterized by pursuit of affirmation or protection of self, combined with alarm and expressive action dimensions of the Anger theme, invoked in the face of perceived Repudiation, draw a striking parallel to the attachment behavior or functional anger described by Bowlby when the attachment figure is unavailable. The readiness with which Preservation action was experienced also appears to be in keeping with Bowlby's contention that "anxious attachment" developed in childhood persists as dysfunctional reunion behavior that is too easily invoked in adulthood.

The experience of the Paradoxical Control cluster does not quite as

easily fit the Interpersonal Attachment framework, and requires somewhat greater interpretive license. To understand Paradoxical Control in attachment terms, it is perhaps helpful to speculate on the experience a child might have in the face of uncertain attachment figure availability. Attachment theory does not provide a description of what it might be like for a child to experience attachment anxiety, nor could it easily do so. The experience of Paradoxical Control may well represent such an experience, carried forward into adulthood along with maladaptive attachment behavior. Hence, the Disintegration Despair (Attachment Anxiety) experience of helpless dependence on the unreliable presence of the attachment figure conflicts with the simultaneous experience of a desperate Preservation (Protest) experience of seeking a sense of security for the survival of self. For the anxiously attached intimate partner abuser, this state of conflicting impulses may be confounded further by experiences of successfully securing attachment figure availability in the past. Alternatively, Paradoxical Control may simply be a further manifestation of the simultaneous experience of the helpless hopelessness of Disintegration Despair and the impulse of Preservation; or in Attachment terms, the simultaneous experience of Attachment Anxiety and attachment Protest impulses.

Attachment/Borderline Experience in Intimate Partner Abuse

In keeping with the observations of Dutton, Saunders, Starzomski, and Bartholomew (1994) regarding a relationship between "fearful"

attachment style and Borderline Personality Organization, the experiences of men in the present study appear to resemble a model of intimate partner abuse that reflects Borderline Personality and Interpersonal Attachment dimensions. In view of the Attachment theory assumption of a mechanism of persistence in attachment style and working models (Bowlby, 1980, pp. 38-43), Borderline Personality Organization and the Interpersonal Attachment approach to intimate partner abuse may effectively be one in the same. The former merely articulates the personality outcome, while the latter elaborates an understanding of developmental contingencies, and the process mechanism by which experience and behavior are maintained.

In considering this synthesis of Borderline Personality Organization and Interpersonal Attachment, we are reminded that intimate partner abuse most commonly occurs "in your own home at the hands of a loved one" (Gelles & Straus, 1988). Borderline Personality and Interpersonal Attachment ultimately underscore a view of intimate partner abuse as an issue of the "heart" manifested in close relationships. They both reflect an understanding of men who abuse their intimate partners as persons wrestling inadequately with basic issues of loneliness, identity, and intense personal attachment to a significant other. It is yet to be established, however, that an Attachment/Borderline approach to intimate partner abuse also alludes to the scaring effect of the ultimate human tragedy of unfulfilled or broken childhood attachment.

When viewed from the perspective of the lived experience of men in the present study, and an Attachment/Borderline model of intimate partner abuse, new meaning accrues to the assertion made by Gelles and Straus (1988, pp. 77-97) that "it is not easy to choose the flight option" in relationship conflict. Given the existential "life and death" seriousness of the experience of Disintegration Despair, from the perspective of a Fragile Self, there is no "flight option." Moreover, the Sociological social exchange assertion that intimate partner abuse persists because "the costs of violence do not out weigh the rewards" also takes on new meaning. The reward of Preservation of a Fragile Self faced with the perceived alternative of disintegration does indeed outweigh the costs of that disintegration. Paradoxically, as Ian most ably articulates, the costs eventually do mount as abusive Preservation attempts eventually undermine Validation.

Notwithstanding findings of the present study that highlight the aversive experiences of men who perpetrate intimate partner abuse, the assertion that men are able to perpetrate intimate partner abuse "because they can" may well remain true. That is, the absence of systemic impediments allows intimate partner abuse to persist; however, the present analysis combined with research on Borderline Personality Organization and Interpersonal Attachment strongly suggest that the incentive to abuse may not lie in the absence of systemic impediments or the presence of superficial social rewards. Future research, social policy, and intervention in intimate

partner abuse that focuses on sociological/systemic variables to the exclusion of the psychology of persons could at best only "control" the problem, not correct it at the source. Certainly, the credibility of Sociological models of intimate partner abuse remains questionable in the absence of adequate discrediting of findings in personality and interpersonal attachment research.

Implications for Future Research

The findings of this study are only capable of pointing us in the direction of an Attachment/Borderline framework of intimate partner abuse. Further research building on the foundation recently laid by Dutton, Saunders, Starzomski, and Bartholomew (1994) may further illuminate this particular approach to understanding intimate partner abuse. Moreover, future research in this direction should address the Feminist observation that intimate partner abuse is predominantly perpetrated by men against women, and be able to explain why men appear to experience or react to Attachment Anxiety (Disintegration Despair) more severely, or perhaps more frequently, than women do. Indeed, it is here that the Feminist assumption of the centrality of gender warrants particular consideration. Hence, future research on differential gender developmental experiences of self, individuation, and attachment may be informative. Future research must also more fully illuminate the relationship between childhood attachment experiences and perpetration of intimate partner abuse, and how childhood

attachment experience interacts with exposure to family of origin abuse. Moreover, the critical feature of Attachment Style must be more clearly integrated into perpetration of intimate partner abuse. Certainly in the absence of further elaboration and support, the present study and the aforementioned research on Attachment and Borderline variables only adds to the overwhelming complexity of extant research and theory on intimate partner abuse.

Conclusion

Notwithstanding the methodological limitations of this study it can be asserted that our understanding of the phenomenon of intimate partner abuse has been extended. In that understanding we are informed that the experience of these men reflects the disheartening paradoxical nature of relationships. That is, these men appeared to seek, but were unable to find security of self in the context of their relationships. Rather, they experienced threat of disintegration in the very place where it was hoped that self would find nurturance and integration.

The present phenomenological analysis surely attests to the severity of anguish that accompanied perpetration of intimate partner abuse with these five men. Hence, our understanding of the phenomenon could be expanded to an appreciation of the very aversive forces of experience associated with intimate partner abuse for this sample. Indeed, it is arguable that the present thematic analysis does illuminate our understanding of

intimate partner abuse in so far as it provides experiential description that animates the phenomenon in a manner not previously achieved. Most notably, it adds a human quality that fills out the skeleton of an Attachment/Borderline approach. In contrast to the ambiance of much research and theory, it begins to put the heart back into the matter. In doing so, it provides a tentative foundation for developing treatment programs that focus on matters of the heart.

References

Alberta Office for the Prevention of Family Violence (1991). Breaking The Pattern: Understanding Wife Abuse. Edmonton Alberta: Office for the Prevention of Family Violence.

Alexander, R. (1993). Wife-battering: An Australian perspective. Journal of Family Violence, 8, (229-251).

Allen, K., Calsyn, D. A., Fehrenbach, P. A., & Benton, G. (1989). A study of the interpersonal behaviors of male batterers. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 4, (79-89).

American Psychiatric Association (1987). Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (3rd edition). Washington: American Psychiatric Association.

Arias, I., & Beach, S. R. H., (1987). Validity of self-reports of marital violence. Journal of Family Violence, 2, (139-149).

Babcock, J. C., Waltz, J., Jacobson, N. S., & Gottman, J. M. (1993). Power and violence: The relation between communication patters, power discrepancies, and domestic violence. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 61, (40-50).

Bandura, A. (1973). Aggression: A Social Learning Analysis. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Barnett, O. W., Fagan, R. W., & Booker, J. M. (1991). Hostility and stress as mediators of aggression in violent men. Journal of Family Violence, 6, (217-241).

Barnett, O. W., & Hamberger, L. K. (1992). The assessment of maritally violent men on the California Psychological Inventory. Violence and Victims, 7, (15-28).

Berg, B. L. (1989). Qualitative Research Methods. Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Vacon.

Bernard, J. L., & Bernard, M. L. (1984). The abusive male seeking treatment: Jekyll and Hyde. Family Relations, 33, (543-547).

Bersani, C. A., Chen, H. T., Pendleton, B. F., & Denton, R. (1992). Personality traits of convicted male batterers. Journal of Family Violence, 7, (123-134).

Birns, B., Cascardi, M., & Meyer, S. (1994). Sex-role socialization: Developmental influences on wife abuse. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 64, (50-59).

Bowlby, J. (1969). Attachment & Loss: Volume I, Attachment. London: Hogarth Press.

Bowlby, J. (1973). Attachment & Loss: Volume II, Separation, Anxiety, and Anger. London: Hogarth Press.

Bowlby, J. (1980). Attachment & Loss: Volume III, Loss, Sadness, & Depression. London: Hogarth Press.

Bowlby, J. (1988). A Secure Base: Clinical Applications of Attachment Theory. London: Routledge.

Bograd, M. (1990). Why we need gender to understand human violence. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5, (132-135).

Cadsky, O, & Crawford, M. (1988). Establishing batterer typologies in a clinical sample of men who assault their female partners. Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 7, (119-127).

Caesar, P. L. (1988). Exposure to violence in the families-of-origin among wife-abusers and maritally nonviolent men. Violence and Victims, 3, (49-63).

Cantos, A. L., Neidig, P. H., & O'Leary, K. D. (1994). Injuries of women and men in a treatment program for domestic violence. Journal of Family Violence, 9, (113-124).

Cappell, C., & Heiner, R. B. (1990). The intergenerational transmission of family aggression. Journal of Family Violence, 5, (135-152).

Carlson, B. E. (1984). Causes and maintenance of domestic violence: An ecological analysis. Social Service Review, Dec, (569-587).

Claes, J. A., & Rosenthal, D. M. (1990). Men who batter women: A study in power. Journal of Family Violence, 5, (215-224).

Coleman, V. E. (1994). Lesbian battering: The relationship between personality and the perpetration of violence. Violence and Victims, 9, (139-152).

Colaizzi P. F. (1978). Psychological research as a phenomenologist views it. In R. S. Valle & M. King (Eds.), Existential-Phenomenological Alternatives for Psychology. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cordova, J. V., Jacobson, N. S., Gottman, J. M., Rushe, R., & Cox, G. (1993). Negative reciprocity and communication in couples with a violent husband. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 102, (559-564).

Curtis, G. C. (1963). Violence breeds violence - perhaps? American Journal of Psychiatry, 120, (386-387).

Dewhurst, A. M., Moore, R. J., & Alfano, D. P. (1992). Aggression against women by men: Sexual and spousal assault. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 18, (39-47).

Doumas, D., Margolin, G., & John, R. S. (1994). The intergenerational transmission of aggression across three generations. Journal of Family Violence, 9, (157-175).

Dutton, D. G. (1988). Profiling of wife assaulters: Preliminary evidence for a trimodal analysis. Violence and Victims, 3, (5-29).

Dutton, D. G. (1994a). Patriarchy and wife assault: The ecological fallacy. Violence and Victims, 9, (167-182).

Dutton, D. G. (1994b). Behavioral and affective correlates of borderline personality organization in wife assaulters. International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 17, (265-277).

Dutton, D. G., & Hemphill, K. J. (1992). Patterns of socially desirable responding among perpetrators and victims of wife assault. Violence and Victims, 7, (29-39).

Dutton, D. G., Saunders, K., Starzomski, A., & Bartholomew, K. (1994). Intimacy-anger and insecure attachment as precursors of abuse in intimate relationships. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24, (1367-1386).

Dutton, D. G., & Strachan, C. E. (1987). Motivational needs for power and spouse-specific assertiveness in assaultive and nonassaultive men. Violence and Victims, 2, (145-156).

Dutton, D. G., & Starzomski, A. J. (1993). Borderline personality in perpetrators of psychological and physical abuse. Violence and Victims, 8, (327-337).

Edleson, J. L., Eisikovits, Z., & Guttman, E. (1985). Men who batter women: A critical review of the evidence. Journal of Family Issues, 6, (229-247).

Edleson, J. L., Eisikovits, Z. C., Guttman, E., & Sela-Amit, M., (1991). Cognitive and interpersonal factors in woman abuse. Journal of Family Violence, 6, (167-182).

El-Sheikh, M. (1994). Children's emotional and physiological responses to interadult angry behavior: The role of history of interparental hostility. Journal of Abnormal Child Psycholgoy, 22, (661-678).

Follingstad, D. R., Rutledge, L. L., Berg, B. J., Hause, E. S., & Polek, D. S. (1990). The role of emotional abuse in physically abusive relationships. Journal of Family Violence, 5, (107-120).

Flournoy, P. S., & Wilson, G. L. (1991). Assessment of MMPI profiles of male batterers. Violence and Victims, 6, (309-320).

Gelles, R. J., & Straus, M. A. (1988). Intimate Violence: The Causes and Consequences of Abuse in The American Family. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Goldstein, D., & Rosenbaum, A. (1985). An evaluation of the self-esteem of maritally violent men. Family Relations, 34, (425-428).

Gondolf, E. W. (1985). Men Who Batter: An integrated approach for stopping wife abuse. Holmes Beach: Learning Publications.

Gondolf, E. W. (1985b). Fighting for control: A clinical assessment of men who batter. Social Casework: The Journal of Contemporary Social Work, January, (48-54).

Gondolf, E. W. (1988). Who are those guys? Toward a behavioral typology of batterers. Violence and Victims, 3, (187-203).

Gough, H. G. (1975). Manual for the California Psychological Inventory. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Grant, L., & Evans, A. (1994). Principles of Behavior Analysis. New York: Harper Collins.

Greene, E. H., Coles, C. J., & Johnson, E. H. (1994). Psychopathology and anger in interpersonal violence offenders. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 50, (906-912).

Hamberger, L. K. (1994). Domestic partner abuse: Expanding paradigms for understanding and intervention. Violence and Victims, 9, (91-93).

Hamberger, L. K., & Hastings, J. E. (1986). Personality correlates of men who abuse their partners: A cross-validation study. Journal of Family Violence, 6, (323-341).

Hamberger, L. K., & Hastings, J. E. (1991). Personality correlates of men who batter and nonviolent men: Some continuities and discontinuities. Journal of Family Violence, 6, (131-147).

Hamberger, L. K., & Potente, T. (1994). Counseling heterosexual women arrested for domestic violence: Implications for theory and practice. Violence and Victims, 9, (125-137).

Hart, S. D., Dutton, D. G., & Newlove, T. (1993). Prevalence of personality disorder among wife assaulters. Journal of Personality Disorders, 7, (329-341).

Hastings, J. E., & Hamberger, L. K. (1988). Personality characteristics of spouse abusers: A controlled comparison. Violence and Victims, 3, (31-48).

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 52, (511-524).

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1994). Attachment as an organizational framework for research on close relationships. Psychological Inquiry, 5, (1-22).

Hershorn, M., & Rosenbaum, A. (1985). Children of marital violence: A closer look at the unintended victims. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 55, (260-266).

Hershorn, M., & Rosenbaum, A. (1991). Over- vs. undercontrolled hostility: Application of the construct to the classification of maritally violent men. Violence and Victims, 6, (151-158).

Hoffman, B.F., & Toner, B. B. (1988). The prevalence of spousal abuse in psychiatric in-patients: A preliminary study. Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 7, (53-60).

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Anglin, K. (1991). The competency of responses given by maritally violent versus nonviolent men to problematic marital situations. Violence and Victims, 6, (257-269).

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Stuart, G. L. (1994). Typologies of male batterers: Three subtypes and the differences among them. Psychological Bulletin, 116, (476-497).

Hotaling, G. T., & Sugarman, D. B. (1986). An analysis of risk markers in husband to wife violence: The current state of knowledge. Violence and Victims, 1, (101-124).

Hotaling, G. T., & Sugarman, D. B. (1990). An analysis of assaulted wives. Journal of Family Violence, 5, (1-13).

Hyden, M. (1995). Verbal aggression as prehistory of women battering. Journal of Family Violence, 10, (55-71).

Jacobson, N. S., Gottman, J. M., Waltz, J., Rushe, R., Babcock, J., & Holtzworth-Munroe, A. (1994). Affect, verbal content, and psychophysiology in the arguments of couples with a violent husband. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 62, (982-988).

Jaffe, P., Wolfe, D., Wilson, S. K., & Zak, L. (1986). Family violence and child adjustment: A comparative analysis of girl's and boy's behavioral symptoms. American Journal of Psychiatry, 143, (74-77).

Julian, T. W., & McKenry, P. C. (1993). Mediators of male violence toward female intimates. Journal of Family Violence, 8, (39-56).

Kandel-Englander, E. (1992). Wife battering and violence outside the family. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 7, (462-470).

Kurz, D. (1989). Social science perspectives on wife abuse: Current debates and future directions. Gender & Society, 3, (489-505).

Kvale, S. (1983). The qualitative research interview. Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, 14, (171-196).

Lackey, C., & Williams, K. R. (1995). Social bonding and the cessation of partner violence across generations. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57, (295-305).

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Neidig, P., & Thorn, G. (1995). Violent marriages: Gender differences in levels of current violence and past abuse. Journal of Family Violence, 10, (159-176).

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., & Vivian, D. (1994). The correlates of spouse's incongruent reports of marital aggression. Journal of family violence, 9, (265-283).

Letellier, P. (1994). Gay and bisexual male domestic violence victimization: Challenges to feminist theory and responses to violence. Violence and Victims, 9, (95-106).

Lewis, B. Y. (1987). Psychosocial factors related to wife abuse. Journal of Family Violence, 2, (1-10).

Lloyd, S. A. (1990). Conflict types and strategies in violent marriages. Journal of Family Violence, 5, (269-284).

Lockhart, L. L., White, B. W., Causby, V., & Isaac, A. (1994). Letting out the secret: Violence in Lesbian Relationships. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 9, (469-492).

Lorenz, K. (1963). On Aggression. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd.

MacEwen, K. E. (1994). Refining the intergenerational transmission hypothesis. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 9, (350-365).

MacEwen, K. E., & Barling, J. (1988). Multiple stressors, violence in the family of origin, and marital aggression: A longitudianal investigation. Journal of Family Violence, 3, (73-87).

Maiuro, R. D., Cahn, T. S., Bitaliano, P. P., Wagner, B. C., & Zegre, J. B. (1988). Anger, hostility, and depression in domestically violent versus generally assaultive men and nonviolent control subjects. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56, (17-23).

Margolin, G., John, R. S., & Gleberman, L. (1988). Affective responses to conflictual discussions in violent and nonviolent couples. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56, (24-33).

Martin, D. (1985). Domestic violence: A sociological perspective. In D. J. Sonkin, D. Martin, and L. E. Auerbach Walker, The Male Batterer: A Treatment Approach. New York: Springer Publishing, (pp. 1-32).

McNeely, R. L., & Robinson-Simpson, G. (1987). The truth about domestic violence: A falsely framed issue. Social Work, 32, (485-490).

Millon, T. (1983). Millon Clinical Multitaxial Inventory Manual. Minneapolis: Interpretive Scoring Systems.

Millon, T. (1987). Manual for the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory - Second Edition. Minneapolis: National Computer Systems.

Morrison, R. L., Van Hasselt, V. B., & Bellack, A. S. (1987). Assessment of assertion and problem-solving skills in wife abusers and their spouses. Journal of Family Violence, 2, (227-238).

Murphy, C. M., & O'Leary, K. D. (1989). Psychological aggression predicts physical aggression in early marriage. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 57, (579-582).

Murphy, C. M., Meyer, S., & O'Leary, K. D. (1993). Family of origin violence and MCMI-II psychopathology among partner assaultive men. Violence and Victims, 8, (165-175).

Murphy, C. M., Meyer, S., & O'Leary, K. D. (1994). Dependency characteristics of partner assaultive men. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 103, (729-735).

O'Keefe, M. (1994). Linking marital violence, mother-child/father-child aggression, and child behavior problems. Journal of Family Violence, 9, (63-78).

Osborne, J. W. (1990). Some basic existential-phenomenological research methodology for counsellors. Canadian Journal of Counselling, 25, (79-91).

Othmer, E., & Othmer, S. C. (1994). The Clinical Interview Using DSM-IV: Volume 1: Fundamentals. Washington: American Psychiatric Press.

Petrik, N. D., Petrik Olson, R. E., & Subotnik, L. S. (1994). Powerlessness and the need to control: The male abuser's dilemma. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 9, (278-285).

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1983). Phenomenological research methods. In R. S. Valle & S. Halling (Eds.), Existential Perspectives in Psychology.

Renzetti, C. M. (1994). On dancing with a bear: Reflections on some current debates among domestic violence theorists. Violence and Victims, 9, (195-200).

Rivera, B., & Widom, C. S. (1990). Childhood victimization and violent offending. Violence and Victims, 5, (19-33).

Rodenburg, F. A., & Fantuzzo, J. W. (1993). The measure of wife abuse: Steps toward the development of a comprehensive assessment technique. Journal of Family Violence, 8, (203-228).

Rosenfeld, B. D. (1992). Court-ordered treatment of spouse abuse. Clinical Psychology Review, 12, (205-226).

Russell, M. (1988). Wife assault theory, research, and treatment: A literature review. Journal of Family Violence, 3, (193-208).

Saunders, D. G. (1991). Procedures for adjusting self-reports of violence for social desirability bias. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 6, (336-344).

Saunders, D. G. (1992). A typology of men who batter: Three types derived from cluster analysis. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 62 (264-275).

Shepard, M. F., & Campbell, J. A. (1992). The abusive behavior inventory: A measure of psychological and physical abuse. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 7, (291-305).

Shields, N. M., McCall, G. J., & Hanneke, C. R. (1988). Patterns of family violence: Violent husbands and violent men. Violence and Victims, 3, (83-97).

Silvern, L, & Kaersvang, L. (1989). The traumatized children of violent marriages. Child Welfare, LXIII, (421-436).

Smith, M. D. (1990). Patriarchal ideology and wife beating: A test of a feminist hypothesis. Violence and Victims, 5, (257-273).

Smith, J. P., & Williams, J. G. (1992). From abusive household to dating violence. Journal of Family Violence, 7, (153-165).

Sonkin, J. S., Martin, D., & Walker, L. E. A. (1985). The Male Batterer: A Treatment Approach. New York: Springer Publishing.

Statistics Canada (1993). The violence against women survey. The Daily, Nov. Ottawa: Marketing Division, Statistics Canada.

Steinmetz, S. K. (1978). The battered husband syndrome. Victimology: An International Journal, 2, (499-509).

Sternberg, K. J., Lamb, M. E., Greenbaum, C., Cicchetti, D., Dawud, S., Cortes, R. M., Krispin, O., & Lorey, F. (1993). Effects of violence on chidren's behavior problems and depression. Developmental Psychology, 29, (44-52).

Stordeur, R. A., & Stille, R. (1989). Ending Men's Violence Against Their Partners: One Road to Peace. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Sout, K. D., 1993). Intimate femicide: A study of men who have killed their mates. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 19, (81-94).

Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The conflict tactics (CT) scales. Journal of Marriage and Family, 41, (75-88).

Straus, M. A., & Gelles, R. J. (1986). Societal change and change in family violence from 1975 to 1985 as revealed by two national surveys. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48, (465-479).

Tavris, C. (1989). Anger: The Misunderstood Emotion. New York: Touchstone.

Thorne-Finch, R. (1992). Ending the Silence: The Origins and Treatment of Male Violence against Women. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Valle, R. S., & King, M. (1978). Introduction to existential-phenomenological thought. In R. S. Valle & M. King (Eds.), Existenital Phenomenological Alternatives for Psychology. New York: Oxford Press.

Van Manen, M. (1990). Researching Lived Experience: Human Science For An Action Sensitive Pedagogy. London: Althouse Press.

Vivian, D., & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (1994). Are bi-directionally violent couples mutually victimized? A gender- sensitive comparison. Violence & Victims, 9, (107-124).

Walker, L. E. (1984). The Battered Woman Syndrome. New York: Springer Publishing.

Wertz, F. J. (1984). Procedures in phenomenological research and the question of validity. In C. M. Aanstoos (Ed.), Exploring the Lived World: Readings in Phenomenological Psychology. Atlanta: Darby Printing Company.

Wertz, F. J. (1986). The question of reliability of psychological research. Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, 17, (181-205).

Widom, C. P. (1989). Does violence beget violence? A critical examination of the literature. Psychological Bulletin, 106, (3-28).

Woffordt, S., Mihalic, D. E., & Menard, S. (1994). Continuities in marital violence. Journal of Family Violence, 9, (195-225).

Yllo, K. (1984). The status of women, marital equality, and violence against wives: A contextual analysis. Journal of Family Issues, 5, (307-320).

APPENDIX ONE

Thematic Abstractions of Ian's Experience

Meaning Unit	Paraphrase	Theme
1. And I guess what I remember is being angry, often. It almost seems like I was always angry, but less angry at times than others.	Recalls persistent, intense anger, but sometimes varying intensity of anger.	Anger.
2. And it almost seemed like underlying it was, underlying the anger was unhappiness with - well first I might think that it was my situation, the scenario that I was in - but then I'd start to dabble with that maybe I was unhappy with myself.	Dissatisfaction with self underlies anger. First looks to context to explain anger.	Anguish.
3. But then I wouldn't touch that very long because, ah that was like life and death stuff, I wouldn't dabble with that. Because if I started dabbling with that I think I'd fall to pieces.	Aware that Self-doubt threatens life & survival. Threat of death or disintegration.	Anguish.
4. So it was almost like the anger was defensive, a defense mechanism. It was ah, it kept my life together, it kept, it helped keep my stuff together you know.	Anger protects self from disintegration.	Validation.

5. And I remember starting to feel, very quietly, very subtly a little bit alone when the kids started to mean something to Kathy. You know once she started to invest time, effort and attention there.	Wife's attention to children triggers feeling alone. The feeling creeps in subtly.	Repudiation.
6. When we dated, man it was ecstasy! This good lookin chick by my side all the time, you know, and she was... She wanted me, she wanted me bad, you know. And she used to tell me about how she dreamed about, about having a date with me when she was younger. And boy that (phew!), and I was ten feet high, I felt good about that.	Early in marriage aware of feeling great in Kathy's company & when she expressed her desire to be with him.	Attachment
7. And ah, so I had a situation there where she just, I was everything to her, and then two years or three years after we were married it didn't seem like I was anything to her.	Aware of diminished desire from Kathy after married 2-3 years.	Attachment.
8. So, some, I don't know how that happened, it was, it, it snuck up on me, but I had this situation and it was awful. I could hardly bear it.	Unexpected intolerable, painful experience emerges.	Anguish.

9. And I did things, um, I did things to her, and around her, to create the scenario where she, was, going to want me, and need me. The need part especially. If she really needed me that made me feel really good.	He manipulates events so she will need him. Being needed is critical to feeling good.	Validation.
10. Angry, anger was the thing that I remember the most! Anger! Just overwhelming anger! So much anger that I couldn't touch the emotion, that triggered the anger. You know.	Aware of overwhelming anger as key emotion. Aware of strong emotion underlying the anger.	Anger.
11. Or if there was an emotion there, that happened, it would happen so fast.	Sudden emotional experience.	Nescience.
12. That's what I knew. That was a legal emotion to have. Like all my buddies at work. Like if you told them that, well, I was hurt because my wife seemed to reject me last night. Ya right! You can't!	Perceived social permission for anger, but not hurt limited emotional repertoire.	Constraint.
13. But I know what triggered it, I was, I was scared, of being alone with this lady. I needed her! I couldn't live without her! I was dependent on her! Totally um, emotionally.	Fear of aloneness. Emotionally dependent on his wife.	Dependence.

14. And if she woke up in the morning and didn't find favour with me I was ugly all day. That's how I saw myself was ugly all day. And work didn't go well.	Self-view depends on her approval of him.	Repudiation.
15. But if I went home and she'd had a tough day with the kids, then man I was nothing but a burden to her and she couldn't deal with me. And I felt rejection from that, and man that made life hell.	Demands of children capture her attention. He interprets as rejection, which triggers anguish.	Repudiation.
16. Like we're talking about life and death stuff here. That's how intense... that ah, I relied on her to make me feel good. It felt like life and death. That's why I got so angry when she would show signs of rejection.	Felt emotional survival threatened because of dependence on her triggers anger.	Dependence.
17. Well, first of all, first of all, there's fear. Like the afraid of being alone part. Um, rejection means, being nothing to this person, and, meaning nothing to them.	Rejection triggers fear of aloneness and feeling insignificant.	Repudiation.

18. And then really to me, I didn't mean anything to myself either. I didn't mean anything to Kathy I know that I meant nothing to myself. Who I was, was tied up in how she saw me.	Own self-worth and identity based on being valued.	Fragile Self.
19. So, when she rejected it felt like death! It felt like, well to become like nobody is like death. So, so that's why I say it was like a life and death situation.	Rejection feels like destruction of self, existence, and death.	Dependence.
20. And if I couldn't get, if couldn't get her to want me, if I couldn't, get her to see me as being meaningful to her, then I would die, emotionally.	Emotional existence depends on her approval. Hence, need to create it.	Validation
21. So, that's what I felt like, you know, pending death. You know, ah, so, so I worked pretty hard, at, at, making her need and want me.	Severity of threat to existence means it's critical that he obtain her approval.	Validation.

22. Because, you know like, she fed me, she fed me emotionally. She fed me. Who I was, was how she saw me. How, how close she was, like, if, if she was, ah, if she wanted to touch me, if she wanted to be with me, if she wanted to seek advice from me. Um, if she wanted my presence. If she needed me, then, I was O.K.	His well being and identity depends on her view/approval of him.	Dependence.
23. If she could live without me, then that was really threatening. I couldn't be on my own, I couldn't be by myself. So, that was certainly dependency because ah... And it was on her too.	Her independence highlights his dependence, invokes aloneness and threatens his existence.	Dependence.
24. It was, it was like an addiction. She was, she was the object of an addiction, it seems. Because, you know I, I had to have my fix. For her to go away for a week was torture.	Dependency was so intense, it was like an addiction.	Constraint.

25. It would be right here. Right at the heart. Physically, like I felt it all over. The physical revelation of the anger was, just so intense. My heart would beat and I would be flushed, and shake.	Experienced anger as intense, concentrated in the heart, but infects the whole body.	Anger.
26. Out of control, of the things about you mostly. And like Kathy was about me. So not having control of that meant that - that was certainly the feeling of helplessness.	Helplessness means out of control of self. Kathy is part of self.	Constraint.
27. And it was something that wasn't aware of, that kind of control that she had over me, and about me.	Unaware of the control she had over him.	Nescience.
28. Ya, about me, like ah, that's the fact that who I am is, is determined by, how she is to me, or how she is around me, how she responds to me. If she doesn't respond, then I'm nobody. So she has control about me, she has control of my being, of who I am.	His identity depends on her responses toward him. Kathy has control over his being.	Dependence.

29. So I would have to work out each and every situation in my mind so that I was satisfied that the actions I had done were appropriate, justified, and provoked. And that I was just doing the right thing.	Need to justify legitimacy of actions through rationalization.	Rumination.
30. Yes. And work it out in my mind. Otherwise I would just be ridden with guilt. I had to take care of that somehow.	Justify and rationalize to relieve guilt.	Rumination.
31. Ya, started to. Well, probably more at first, then I got numb to it. The guilt was, something that I didn't wear well. And so I, I would shed it pretty fast. Especially over time. Because, especially when it reoccurred over an over and over again. I, I'd have to get pretty numb.	Importance of guilt avoidance through emotional suppression over time.	Nescience.

32. But back then boy the only happiness there was, was ah, was having a, having a good secure income. Having a home that was paid for. We lived in a home that was paid for and that felt good. That was a real, that was something that made me feel good. Having a wife, there, at my beck and call, that felt real good.	Happiness contingent on security, money, materialism. Traditional wife produces happiness.	External-Material.
33. The kids were a general irritation. I mean when people said gee your kid's cute, that felt good.	Approval of kids is validating.	External-Material
34. Because the pain was just a little too intense. That was a burning, burning, intense pain inside. I felt it mostly in, in my gut area but, I, I felt the physical, burning pain through my whole body.	Separation pain manifests intense burning starting in the gut, but permeates entire body.	Anguish.
35. Up steady, just working this issue, working it, and working it and trying to resolve it for myself. And all I could come up with was she's got to come back or I'm dead. There's got to be, and it really can't be this way, it just can't And it won't be like this.	Attempt to resolve the separation. Concludes she must return for him to survive. Desperate.	Rumination.

36. Like, like, stop this because you are mine, and you will respond to me and you will want me.	Ownership and importance of being needed or wanted.	Validation.
37. If she cried I would, I would be so dumb as to think she was crying because of the fear of the breakup, or the fear of the loss of relationship with me. Like, I don't know how I talked myself into thinking that that was taking place, but I think did. I really believed that this was a preferable response to see from her.	Distorts her tears as a fear of relationship disintegration; that she cares for him. Aware of rationalizing the meaning of her response.	Rumination.
38. And so when I felt, not able to impact her emotionally about this situation, and getting after her, I felt a little bit of her slipping away out of my control here. And that, bothered me a lot.	Feels unable to influence and control her. Invokes emotional concern.	Constraint.
39. And then the rejection that happened. I sensed a rejection from, her to me She'd been so cold for so long, then, for some time up until then.	Experienced Kathy's rejection.	Repudiation.

40. And ah, I remember, not being able to ah, to let that register, the fact that I had hurt her. I had to put that away, I had to suppress that. It couldn't register at the time. Or I wouldn't have been able to carry on. I would have stopped.	Needs to suppress awareness of harm. Awareness of harm would stop the violence.	Nescience
41. And the more it went away the more angrier I got. The angrier I got the worse it made it, it seemed, and then the worse I made it the less assurance there was. So just kind of, built on itself, it avalanched. That started to happen so fast.	Uncertain, vanishing happiness invokes anger. Anger compounds uncertainty, and snowballs.	Anger.
42. Well first to resolve the self-esteem issue. And I still work at that. That's going to be a life long thing for me. That's very obvious. Resolving that, that issue. Because I still, you know I get happy with myself and then something happens that I become unhappy with myself.	Resolution of low self-esteem instrumental in ending battering. This is a long-term undertaking.	Fragile Self.
43. And I think that's the single biggest step that I took towards resolving the self-esteem issue, was finding myself acceptable.	Acceptance by God permits self-acceptance.	Fragile Self.

APPENDIX TWO

Thematic Abstractions of Peter's Experience

Meaning Unit	Paraphrase	Theme
1. But in my mind at the start of each abusive session right would be something where I felt I was right and that she was wrong and it seemed paramount to prove - that it was my point - I had to prove my point.	Significance of establishing that he is right.	Validation.
2. I don't know what it would be about, and that's one thing that has stuck in my mind that I can never remember say a day or two afterwards what exactly the argument was about.	Almost immediate inability to recall conflict content.	Nescience.
3. And I'd become very impatient and very fast. Like it was almost like I had to get my point across so fast that she couldn't comprehend it. Like why can't you understand this.	A rushed feeling. The urgency of establishing his point.	Urgency.
4. Just the amount of frustration. I'd feel balled up inside like why can't you see this. It's hard to put into words. The frustration level was high that she couldn't see my point right away.	The inability to establish his point produces a somatic constrained feeling.	Constraint.

5. I found it very hard to sit still when we had these arguments. I'd pace back and forth. I'd go from room to room. Tidying up this, picking up this and then putting it down. Always with her tagging behind and trying to talk to me while I'm racing from room to room.	Felt restless, pursued, and tried to escape her during conflicts.	Escape.
6. She would say something that would just ah touch something inside of me that would instantly get my anger up. I could feel anger.	Her action could arouse an obscure inner force that triggered anger.	Anger.
7. Before would be like totally inconsequential. But for some reason it would trigger this instant pang of anger or fear in me.	Insignificant issue triggers sudden anger or fear.	Anger.
8. A feeling that I had to be on the defense. And my defense at that point was to turn to anger.	Experience of being threatened. Self-protection with anger.	Validation.
9. Definitely there's a hurt factor. And hurt is a hard thing to describe. It's deep inside. I can't really put it into words. Just the feeling or the need to be on the defensive.	Aroused inner emotional pain that isn't easily verbalized. Feel threatened and compelled to protect himself.	Anguish.

10. Definitely hurt. . . Done wrong. Done wrong. She said something that doesn't sound right to me that seems like its a not right, not justified, so I feel hurt.	Her action experienced as unwarranted and produces emotional pain.	Anguish.
11. Just a big quantum leap into this anger like I've got to get back at her at all costs. Yes, it would happen very suddenly.	Dramatic change to an anger state and compulsion to retaliate.	Validation.
12. I had a hard time, actually recalling each episode because they were such fits of rage that, where everything was unleashed in one shot within probably, um five minute, ten minute incident and I wouldn't recall much of it even an hour later.	Sudden, dramatic and brief trans-formation of affective state into anger, followed by amnesia.	Nescience.
13. I'd feel like I had to lash out at something. Smashing things, like ah, feeling like none of this matters. None of this physical stuff we have here, the things we've accumulated, because we're feeling so shitty at this time, so I may as well smash it. Just a lot of feeling of desperation. Like what good is all this stuff when I feel so shitty?	Significant, desperate inner emotional pain underlies a compulsion to retaliate against the outer world.	Anguish.

14. OK, tension to begin with, extreme tension in probably every muscle in the body. A feeling of wanting to hurt. You've been hurt, so now I have to hurt her.	Somatic tension accompanies the experience of emotional harm and the urge to retaliate.	Constraint.
15. I keep talking about need to do something, I don't know what the feelings are exactly other than the hurt and the desperation, the anger, and fear that drive that. But what I can tell you best about was what it did to me, and that's that lashing out.	A complex of severe emotional pain, fear, and anger prompt a compulsion to take outward aggressive action.	Validation. Anguish.
16. Well towards the end of each episode, the fear of losing her. The fear of people finding out what I'd done, what kind of person that I was. Mostly that. I'd say that was the biggest fear, the fear that this time she might not understand and make up.	Abusive events culminate in the experience of fear of loss and of discovery. Fear of relational loss.	Repudiation.

17. You know she's just about at the end of her rope. . . . But the fear was of being on my own. I'd never been on my own before. As a bachelor per se. So I didn't know how to cook a meal or anything like that. I'd never been out shopping really. . . I'd say the fear, the biggest fear was her leaving me, and being by myself.	Fear of relational loss, abandonment, and of being alone.	Repudiation.
18. But I remember going towards the bedroom and she's following behind, you know, we're going to talk this out. You know, you're not going to put this off again.	Experience of being pursued and pressured by her.	Constraint.
19. And when I'm cornered, that's when I think I finally, my springs sprung and I'm gone, and I start lashing out and this particular time I don't even say a word, I don't even know my fist is going out. And it just connected with her face, and I find that I'm just basically pummeling her and hitting her in the stomach, and ah, kicking her just to get her the heck out of the way. And I so just flee out of the room and go down, into the living room.	Feeling constrained triggers a sudden unreflected violent outburst intended to facilitate escape.	Escape.

20. And ah, she's saying damn it we're talking this out. I don't care what it takes, you can beat me to a pulp. So I say leave me alone I can't take this anymore, and by this time I'm in tears also. And ah, why are you chasing me? Like, just leave me alone.	Feeling pursued, emotional distress, and wanting to escape and avoid something.	Escape.
21. I almost feel, like, claustrophobic. And finally I can break loose and I just run out the door, front door, and run down the street. And that'd be the end of that one.	Feeling constrained and the need to escape.	Escape.
22. A lot of these times it would be a plea from me, I just need time to calm down, don't just keep pushing me. But she always seemed like in such a desperate need to get answers, to talk it all out. It made me feel like, like I say, almost claustrophobic.	Feels intense constraint of his urgent need to escape the arousal state.	Escape.
23. It would go, I guess it would transition from a feeling a real sense of rage, a feeling of rage and just lashing out to hurt her, to one of just trying to flee, trying to get away.	Sequence of emotions: From intense anger and the harm impulse to fear and the escape impulse.	Anger.

24. Just that feeling of being in a small space. I can't stand being in a small space. I feel smothered. And that's how I'd feel and I just got to get out into the open. I got to get some fresh air and run.	Desperation and the need to escape are initiated by feeling constrained.	Constraint.
25. I know I looked into her eyes. But, when I actually lashed out, it wasn't, I don't think I saw anything. It would be almost everything went into a haze. I would just wail away.	Visual blindness and amnesia for abusive events.	Nescience.
26. And this pent up emotion that's deep within you, that you refuse to recognize, every so often takes control of you and you lash out in such a sudden burst of energy. Here's me. Hear me roar. I will be heard. That's how I, ah, that's how I see it happen for me.	Awareness of underlying emotional forces that escape control and demand recognition.	Anguish.
27. So a big sense of, like I'm nothing. Just scared of the outside world. Like I said before, just the absolute fear of failing. Just scared of the outside world. Like I said before, just the absolute fear of failing.	Low self-worth and fear of failure.	Fragile Self.

28. Um I just thought people would look down on me. Would ridicule me. Like no sense of self-worth, no belief in myself. And that if I did fail the humiliation would be too great.	Low self-esteem, fear of failure, and fear of humiliation.	Fragile Self.
29. Ya, very much so for the, especially for the first, while we were going out. We spent nearly every waking minute together. I didn't have any problem talking to .... or her to me . . . So a lot of our first going out was telling each other's story to each other, and sympathizing with each other and holding each other and trying to comfort the other person.	Intense courtship attachment experience.	Attachment.
30. And, when you categorize the first part of our relationship it was definitely communication. Everything went, nothing was ever held back. . . We spent a lot of time just as friends consoling each other and helping each other out, almost being like a crutch to each other.	Initial mutual openness, sharing, and emotional support in the relationship.	Attachment.

31. And, I told her that I'd never been intimate with a girl before. And at this point in time I was about 20 years old. Because I was just too damn scared. I never had any faith in myself. And, ah, so, anything went. I told her everything, I was totally honest with her. I was scared stiff of even touching her for the first while. And then eventually, we knew that actual love was growing between us.	His initial openness with her about his feelings and fears.	Attachment.
32. I'd say the comfort zone increased so much that, ah I felt like I could get away with stuff. That I didn't have to give in at any time. And I'd say the biggest change was that I could be in control. I felt like I could start controlling.	As the relationship solidified, he became more controlling.	Attachment.

33. And things started to take over rather than people. Like the cushions on the couch had to be a certain way. Traits that my dad and mom used to instill in us kids, started creeping in. The car always had to be clean. If the kids got in they darest not kick the seats because I'd just vacuumed it or something like this. And there'd be a sharp word to the kids. The grass always had to be mowed.	With relational comfort came a shift in focus away from his wife and children to material objects.	External-Material
34. Slowly, gradually, ever increasing, to the exclusion of spending time with my kids, making sure that I had a kind word for them, or complimenting them on a test they'd done at school.	Progressive shift in focus away from his children.	External-Material.
35. So when people would come up to me and ask me about this or that, it was just a burden on me. It was a taking up my time. So a great feeling of impatience.	Due to the urgency of material demands, relational demands were intolerable.	Urgency.

36. I'd always try and, well, justifying it I guess. I'd feel like, ah, if I stayed quiet she'd be the winner and I'd be the loser. Like her point was right and I was wrong.	He attempts to avoid fault. The importance of establishing himself as correct.	Validation.
37. Ah, well, like I say, everything started to have, started to have a structure, or have to have a structure. Everything had to be in its place.	Emergence of a need to have strict order.	External-Material.
38. Time wise if something didn't go according to plan, you know we said we were going to leave at seven o'clock and didn't. Ah, I'd feel rushed, well scared that whoever we were going to meet on time was going to think badly of us. You know. Worried about meeting other people on time.	The experience of urgency and impatience. Fear of being judged poorly by others.	Urgency.
39. The whole situation. Not being on time. Not being able to get out the door. No matter what we do it seems to take forever to get going.	Feelings of urgency and impatience.	Urgency.

40. I felt it like a personal affront. Like your job means more to you than us. A lot of times she's supposed to be home at 5 o'clock and we wouldn't see her 'till seven. But wouldn't get a phone call saying I'm going to have to work late. By the time she'd be in the middle of an emergency situation and she just couldn't think about family at that point in time.	He interprets her focus on work as threat to the family.	Repudiation
41. Just the incredible urge or the want to hurt. . . but in one of those, you're not thinking, your mind is not working, as it normally is.	Experience of the mindless compulsion to retaliate and harm.	Nescience.
42. It's almost like one channel. Everything else is excluded. And, ah, your whole being is put into lashing out. I can't describe it in any other way.	A singular, narrow focus on retaliating.	Constraint.
43. But if anything was going on in my mind at that point in time it would be just focused right on her. And ah, just feeling that incredible rage and hurt, and ah, the feeling of wanting to get back at her all in a split second.	The sudden experience of a complex of emotional pain, intense anger, and revenge impulse.	Anger.

44. The night that she laid it on me we were in the park just down the street from our house. There again I felt an incredible amount of rage and disappointment or betrayal would be a good word, I felt betrayed.	Feeling of betrayal.	Anguish.
45. Where there was the feeling of wanting to get back at her. You've betrayed me, so now I have to get back at you somehow. So, the way I was talking to her was very, like here you are ready to give up on the marriage again, you know you are always so quick to give up on things, you know. . . Statements, basically to the effect that you are betraying me and the kids. We are going to be a broken family, just another statistic. I know I still love you, why can't you love me?	The feeling of being emotionally harmed and abandoned, followed by the compulsion to seek revenge.	Repudiation.

46.

I know I do my job well and so I have a lot of self-esteem in that regards. Relationship wise, the job's over at 4:30 I go home. I know for a fact a lot of self-confidence, self-esteem would drop of dramatically, by the very fact that let's always stay inside, let's not go out and socialize with these people. Why do we have to go over there? That sort of thing. Because I always felt inferior to other people.

Low unstructured social self-worth is experienced most dramatically in the marital setting.

Fragile Self.

APPENDIX THREE

Thematic Abstractions of Jack's Experience

Meaning Unit	Paraphrase	Theme
1. We're having a discussion and I'm a little frustrated. I should say something right out there and then. I keep it inside me. I ball it up inside me and then blow up a little bit.	Withholds expression of emotions. Withheld emotions fester and explode.	Constraint.
2. I'm a little angry. I'm pissed off right. I'm not going to lash out or nothing like that. I push it to a point like a nag. I'm not trying to put her down but I'm just saying you're lazy, or whatever.	Feels angry and expresses it by verbally harrassing her.	Anger.
3. It's pretty frustrating. I like to do something about it when I can't really do anything. I try discussing with her and all I get is a smart remark. And I didn't mean to get a smart remark back. I'm not trying to say a smart remark, but I'm just getting that back against me.	Feels powerless and thwarted in his ability to resolve conflict.	Constraint.

4. And it's like what, I didn't come home to this. And it's like I didn't want this. Like let's have a discussion here. And I guess I just kind of push too much.	Feels unjustly treated. Attempt to resolve conflict becomes aggression.	Validation.
5. And it's like OK lets do this, this, and this. Again I get it done, vacuuming or whatever. So I say why don't you do something else. It's like I don't want to do this because I can't do this.	He initiates domestic activity and perceives relational inequity.	External-Material
6. It hurts me a little, but I just don't want to nag at it. Then, when it balls up inside me for such a long time, like two weeks or a month or whatever and she'll lash out or something and I'll lash out back, just retaliate and just trying to protect myself.	Suppressed hurt feelings accumulate and finally explode in a defensive response to her aggression.	Validation.
7. And then, when she nags at me like something like that, I'll hold a glass and put it away or clean it or whatever right. And I go just click, click, click, click. And all of a sudden it smashes. And I won't feel anything, and I'm holding the glass in my hand and I'm not bleeding or anything.	He responds to feeling harrassed by her by breaking something.	Anger.

8. It's just frustration. I'm just getting my anger out on the glass. She says you just wrecked a glass. And I say ya so. And then I take a walk.	Expresses anger physically and then leaves.	Anger.
9. And I apologize. And I say I'm sorry or whatever. That doesn't cut it, it's like you have to prove it too me, that sort of thing. And it's a little frustrating because, OK what do I have to do, and I try to do it slowly and it felt like I'm doing something right, but not in her eyes.	He perceives his attempts to reconcile are unacknowledged, and feels unappreciated.	Repudiation.
10. I'm feeling kind of angry and feel ashamed. It's like why did she do this to me? Did I do? Did I do something to deserve this? For what she did? Maybe I did and maybe I didn't.	Perception of having been harmed, feeling angry and humiliated, and trying to make sense of things.	Rumination.
11. I was feeling, ya, I was feeling a bit hurt, by it, because that's how I took it. It kind of caught me, it kind of choked up in anger. And I didn't want to say anything to her. I was just kind of sitting there. Ya, and I just didn't want to show it. I just, I kept quiet about it and just went outside and took a walk.	Perception of being harmed, and the withholding of emotional expression.	Anguish.

12. I felt empty, a little bit lost. And I said, think, what is the best way to think positive for myself?	Feeling alone and trying to make things OK for himself.	Anguish
13. I begin to think. I begin to think. OK, what did I do wrong? Did I do something wrong? Did I go the wrong way? Did I deserve this response? Maybe I did? Maybe I did? I wasn't sure?	Trying to make sense out of conflictual events. Dwells.	Rumination.
14. She was right. We had to communicate. And I couldn't communicate. I just had to shut up and that's not communicating. But I had to think before, what I say.	The inability to express his feelings to her.	Constraint.
15. I didn't feel angry. I didn't feel physical. I just, had to think. I didn't know what to do. I was in the neutral space. A person could be talking to me, and I'm just sitting there thinking about it.	Experience of needing to detach and contemplate things.	Rumination.

16. Well, I like to get things done. I'm not saying I have a neatness kick, I just want to get this done. It's part of chores. You know. It's like, aren't you sick and tired of this? Look at this, look at the whole picture here. It's a mess.	Tendency to take action on domestic maintenance.	External-Material.
17. It makes me sick. It makes me really want to puke. It's just like, I want to say something, but I don't have the right to say something, but I should say something. And I, if I say something, I might say it wrong, and come out being angry, and have an argument, and I didn't want to have that. I say, when are we going to do it here? Don't bug me she says.	Feels torn between expressing and not expressing himself.	Constraint.
18. It takes a lot of my energy out. Um, I feel drained. It's just frustrating, mentally. I sometimes get a throbbing headache and I've got to rest. Got to sit down and not think about nothing, just rest and sleep, or whatever, and just relax. Because I don't want to dwell on it.	Conflicts are emotionally, mentally, and physically depleting. He needs to calm his thoughs and feelings.	Anger.

19. Should I do it? Could I do it? I volunteer to do it. Now? . . . And I say well, gee. What should I do here? Do I nag? Or something else? And it just builds up. Leave it to another time? Let it ride? I just let it ride. But I shouldn't do that though, I feel. But I let it, I let it ride. Until something else triggers me off.	Conflicting impulses of expressing or not expressing himself. Withheld expression accumulates and eventually succumbs to stimulation and explosive expression.	Rumination.
20. And the day I brought her some flowers, dozen roses. She says, what's this for? Um, I just wanted to get them, get them to you. I just wanted me to feel good. I didn't want any sexual favors or nothing right, or anything. I just felt like I wanted to do this for you. I just felt that, thank you or whatever.	Unacknowledged attempts at reconciliation and affection.	Validation.
21. Yah, and I say OK fine, I'll do that, but the fact is I don't want to put up with the mess. And I'll make a snide remark. And she says, it's not your house. Well, geez. It's like someone is going to have to say something sooner or later, you know, like, OK, and I make a snide remark.	The compulsion to comment on things that bother him about her.	External-Material.

22. And it's just a little frustrated, and that, and I take three or four, five hits and then, and I'm still, and I'm beginning to getting a little hot and angry. I says, geez, what did I do to deserve this? Did I deserve this? Sure I'll take a few, four, five hits, sure, fine, I deserve it. And she kept on going, fine, I'd just lash out, how does this feel?	Physical abuse from her prompts attempts to understand, frustration, and then anger and explosive retaliation.	Repudiation. Validation.
23. I want a hug, I want to hug you. OK, and she says, you don't want to hug me, you just want to feel me up and you want to kiss me. And I don't want to be kissed. Well I just want to hug you. She says, don't touch me. I say, OK fine. . . And then I say fine, then I guess I don't want a kiss.	Attempts at affection are discounted and rejected.	Repudiation.

24. Hurt, hurt. And I want to say something bad. Ah, maybe something sarcastic. It's just hurt. I'd end up putting her down again, and not thinking of what I should say before I should say it. And not meaning it, and it's like, OK fine, OK. And even if I didn't think about that. I'd say I wasn't thinking that at all, and then I'd say something sarcastic. And, huh, huh, it just hurts me thinking about saying something, you know, it's just, just frustrating.	Feeling hurt prompts the unreflected impulse to retaliate with verbal abuse.	Anguish.
25. But, at least, I just say, at least could you tell me you love me, and I say, I love you, and I tell you that. And she says, I'm tired of hearing that, I know you do that. It's like, can I hear something. She says, no, you know I do. I says, well geez, I like to hear it once in a while.	Requests affirmation of affection, but is denied.	Repudiation.
26. Hurt! Ah, what did I do? She says, oh, you're playing the same record over and over again. And then I'm getting sarcastic remarks, OK, fine.	When she rejects him, he feels hurt and confused, and resorts to verbal abuse.	Anguish.

27. That past relationship I've never forgotten about because I cared for her that much. And I treat her as, what I treat that last relationship. And she's a little choked with that.	Aware of the role that a previous relationship played in recent marital conflict.	Attachment.
28. And I bring it, everything comes back a little bit. And I just didn't want to be hurt again. And I'm bringing it on to her. It's just like, oh, oh.	Insight that the pain of a previous rejection affects his present relationship.	Attachment.
29. And it hurts. It's just, you've never forgotten the hurt. And I say, yah, so, can't a guy think about it? And I make a smart remark. I say, can't a guy hurt a little bit?	Awareness of his primary relational wound.	Attachment.
30. She says, you're with me right now, can't you forget about it? I say, yah, well, it hurts. She is to a point, but, it hurts too much because I still care, and I shouldn't be, shouldn't be, because it's past, and I'm with you right now, and it's just, yah.	The emotional pain from, and continued attachment to a previous lover negatively impinges on his present relationship.	Attachment.
31. Something would happen, she might say something. It would dawn on me two days later.	Delayed awareness and reaction	Nescience.

32. Well, it didn't dawn on me back then, and it dawned on me now. And I'm worrying about it now. What's going on, why did you do that for? It wasn't much of a concern, but now it's a concern now. Why?	Delayed awareness and reaction.	Nescience.
33. Yah, and I'm asking her why too. I say, why, why did you do that? She says, why are you saying that now. I say, well, it just dawned on me now . . . And I didn't think about it, and it wasn't too much of a concern at the time.	His delayed reactions a source of conflict for her.	Nescience.
34. For me yes, um, because, maybe it was unimportant at the time for me. And then I think about it. So OK. She wouldn't have said anything to me if it wasn't important. She wouldn't say it. And I acknowledged it.	Needs time to process the significance of events.	Nescience.
35. Fine, I'll leave it alone. Then it dawns on me, what the hell's, what are you doing? Why did you do that? Yah, and then I get all caught up again and we're doing it all over again.	Delayed reaction prompts conflict.	Nescience.

APPENDIX FOUR

Thematic Abstractions of Lawrence's Battering Experience

Meaning Unit	Paraphrase	Theme
1. I sat there, I thought OK, I feel this aggression. I'd felt the aggression before, but I've stifled it. And I was thinking, don't freak out Lawrence, you're close to the edge. I knew I was getting quite crazy from the alcohol.	Aware of the intensity of his anger, the alcohol induced unstable mental state, and attempts to control himself with self-talk.	Substance Abuse.
2. I felt that I had rehearsed in my mind the thought of throttling her and just slapping her and saying, look you silly bitch understand this, you know. Why don't you make sense, be rational. Shake some sense into her, but this was not, ah, something I wanted to do, although I had gone through it in my mind many times.	Repeated thoughts of seeking releif from confusion & craziness by assualting her, conflict with the impulse not to do so.	Rumination.
3. Ah, I said, here, come on, sit down, let's talk. And, ah, she refused to do so. She, ah, flipped me the finger, told me to fuck off. And I sat there and I didn't do anything, and she went down for a cigarette and some, ah, oh, maybe half a minute, minute and a half, I'm not sure, it's kind of hard to describe, because things clouded in.	His attempt to relate to her is met with rude rejection, followed by fading consciousness.	Repudiation.

4. I was drunk, I felt I was trapped. I didn't have much else to do, ah, other than follow through on my plans in the sense of desperation to end it, because my mind was coming apart. I went downstairs and, ah, I said, ah, something to the effect of, well now you've been wanting to die all of this time, now is your chance.	Feeling of inescapable mental deterioration and helplessness breaks normal violence restraint.	Validation.
5. Ah, the feelings at the time was, I sort of came to, when I had my hands around her neck after about five or ten seconds of this, and she's saying to me, Lawrence you're choking me, Lawrence you're choking me, you're choking me. And, ah, I sort of came to with that, and she called my name, and it sort of brought a recognition back to me.	Brief lapse in consciousness revived by her voice and the sound of his name.	Nescience.
6. Ah, at the time I was clenching my jaws to the point where my teeth where hurting, like for days. I, ah, felt a rush of adrenalin when I was, ah, attacking her, and immediately after.	Somatic symptoms of muscular tension in the jaw and intense autonomic arousal	Anger.

7. It occurred, I don't think lasted more than 20 seconds, but it seems like it was quite long at the time.	The brief episode experienced as expanded time.	Nescience.
8. Frustrated, lonely, abused, ah, in the way of emotional abuse. I would feel betrayed. Ah, the deception is something that really bothers me. When people lie to me, or use me as a fool, or disrespect me. I have a lot of problem with that. Especially the deceit, or trying to tell me one story, and it changes over time.	Feels mistreated, abandoned, and alone when he perceives that she has decieved him.	Anguish.
9. But at the time because of the delusional or paranoid nature that I had because alcohol was making me crazy, ah, I was fearful of that. I felt the relationship was coming down around, it was down to its knees, but.	Delusion and paranoia associated with substance abuse contribute to deterioration of the relationship.	Substance Abuse.
10. Self, ah, self, ah, depreciating type of thoughts. That, oh, I'm not worth it, I don't have a decent girl friend because I'm a this, I'm a that. And that's why I'm suffering this fate. And things like that.	Rumination over negative self-worth.	Fragile Self.

11. Oh, it's a very horrible feeling. Ah, it's a feeling of very closed, ah, a watched closed feeling. Ah, a feeling of, ah, internal stress. A lot of tenseness. Ah, a lot of, ah, almost supernatural type of belief patterns.	Paranoia is marked by cognitive rumination, tension, and a dreadful feeling of constraint.	Anguish.
12. Ah, trapped, vindictive. Somehow on the side of right. I would be self-justifying my own behaviors or thoughts. I would be very judgmental. Ah, very, ah, much retribution and vengeance, ah, that sort of thing, an eye for an eye stuff.	Ambiance of being captured by self-certainty, the need to confirm that certainty, and the need to seek revenge.	Validation.
13. Anger. A severe amount of anger. Betrayal. A sense of, ah, injustice, ah, lack of trust. I don't know, I think I'm going in circles on this, because the whole issue surrounds trust, violation of confidence, ah, betrayal. It just, it just keeps going in a circle basically. I think it's locked into a route, of sorts.	Ambiance of non-marital betrayal of trust that belies anger.	Repudiation.

14. Where were you? Oh, oh, geeze are you put out, hah, hah, hah, you know, belittling me. And, ah, I didn't say a thing, and ah, really, ah, I wish I had, but I wasn't allowed to. Because I couldn't give her shit for going out with her friend. Ah, because if I was to say anything bad to her it might upset her. Nor could I say anything to her friend, because her friend has a mental condition, which you don't want to rattle her because it might upset her, and she might, it might make her worse, and all this sort of thing.	Feels unable to respond to disparaging remarks. Implicit exaggeration of emotional distancing.	Constraint.
15. And I became extremely angry. And I wouldn't say anything I was holding it all inside, and I was very controlled. But it was like a pressure keg that was building. And it wasn't something that was ah, ah, was designed to explode. It was something that you know, the thoughts were already in my mind. I had a control on my physical actions, but I didn't have control on my anger.	Felt able to control the expression of anger, but not its explosive experience or the retaliatory thoughts.	Anger.

16. And it got to a point where I would think of, ah, to hell with it all, you know go through these verbal things in my head where I tell her off in my mind. But I don't say it verbally, but I would let her know in indirect ways by slamming the door, being cold, or turning the cold shoulder to her, and a passive behavior.	Ruminates over verbal expression of anger, but redirects it through nonverbal forms.	Constraint.
17. I asked her to tone her voice down, and try and speak in civil tones please, and how come she's doing that? I felt very embarrassed and paranoid. And, ah, humiliated. The humiliation was quite great. And I felt that, ah, you know, it's not, it's a manageable situation, but, rather than quiet down, she got even more adamant about things and said well fuck, if that's the way you feel, I'll scream at the top of my lungs and you'll really be embarrassed won't you.	Feels fear and humiliation. Attempts at resolution are met with more abuse, which constrains further attempts.	Fragile Self.

18. And, ah, then I would verbalize upstairs things that I wouldn't dare say to her, like I should have all of your stuff put in (moving) van and ship it off. And, why don't you go and kill yourself? That's what you seem to be wanting to do anyway, and you know things like that.	Avoids direct confrontational sharing of thoughts and feelings.	Constraint.
19. Awe, a sense of rip off, like they don't care about me. It was a sense of I didn't count. Ah, over all I guess my perception was that I was give, give, give, give, give, give, and get treated like a door mat. Ah, financially, emotionally, ah, physically, ah, to some degree spiritually.	Anger rooted in an experience of emotional abuse, neglect, and rejection.	Repudiation.

20. If I'm doing all of these good things, it's maybe a sort of conditional form of love. Where I'm saying, ah, I'll do this for me, if you love me and respect me. Maybe I'm saying if I, ah, make you coffee in the morning, bring your breakfast up to you, give you your pills, well, then, please, treat me with respect and be able to do shopping at six o'clock. Whereas, being flipped off and ah, being told, ah, well I'm not going shopping, I'm going with my friend and drive around.	Ponders that he has been trying to earn affection and respect, but perceives rejection.	Validation.
21. I was aware of the sound and the feeling of having the hands around her neck, and the struggle and the force, how much force she had, and not very much else.	Awareness limited to the physical sensation of force and of strangling her during assault.	Nescience.
22. Because I actually ended up with a few bruises, and a real sore jaw, because she decked me. She was able to hook me pretty good, you know, trying to break free. And ah, you know I didn't feel a thing, actually until the next day.	Unaware of physical harm to himself during assault.	Nescience.

23. Ah, what was I aware, everything clouded in. You see when I was actually just, after it had gone past the point of control, when I got up and a minute and a half after being told to fuck off and given the finger, I was still sitting there.	A blurring of consciousness as escalation to violence begins.	Nescience.
24. And it just, like my vision tunneled in, literally, like it was everything got darker, just only sort of a very focused look ahead, I sort of glassed over. It was like ah, like a wave came over me, where I just seemed to relate back to my brainstem, and my upper level functions or consequences or anything else be damned. I was just going to show her how I felt.	A sense of blurred darkenss, with a narrow visual focus, and of being seized by the compulsion to express feelings.	Nescience.
25. Well it was dark, and the lights were subdued in the house, and it was dim in the basement, and ah, I was close to seeing double as well. I was extremely drunk, you know. Like normally I would drink beer, but this time it was hard liquor. And I was extremely drunk and I couldn't hardly even walk straight. I sort of hunkered over and grabbed her.	The setting and being drunk accent and confound the visual experience.	Substance Abuse.

26. And ah, I walked over to her and ah was saying things like, ah, so you wanted to die, now's your chance. I kicked the table over because she was just dismissing me, she wasn't even paying attention or looking at me. She was, I got her attention by kicking the table over and by that time I'd grabbed her neck, and she was aware that I was angry.	Feeling neglected and ignored, he seeks her attention with threats and violence.	Repudiation.
27. So when I was actually doing it there was a feeling of rage. It was rage. It was like something I'd practiced in my mind. And I'd gone through this sort of staged rehearsal, probably for a couple, or six weeks before.	Experience of intense anger in a form similar to previous ruminations.	Anger.
28. Well, the point is, I sort of go through the theory, and I feel sort of justified. Ah yes, here's another, another instance of her having mood swings, and setting out to disappoint me. And you know, this is part of the pattern I've noticed, and I feel sort of justified in that.	Rationalizing to justify his perceptions and obtain a tolerable resolution.	Rumination.

29. I would become very angry and I would ah, you know, just have black ones. And I'd, I'd let my head lock in more. I, I'd get more sort of looped on this anger thing. And I'd let my thoughts rest in the same place.	Dwelling on perceived betrayals entrenches him a distressful state.	Anger.
30. Well, yah, to some degree I become preoccupied. I think what it is my brain just, ah, cycles into a familiar pattern of, of sort of stops in a, in a route on a rally race of sorts. There's various check points. And I've got many different ways of getting to those check points, but I keep ending up at that same path.	Rumination and rationalization in circles marked by dwelling on common themes.	Rumination.
31. It's, supposedly I'm trying for linear, sort of rational thought, logical, antecedent, consequent. But what happens is I end up coming back to the same emergency, the feeling of, of betrayal or the feeling of lack of trust. Where I end up coming back to the same point again, that starts me off.	Attempts at rational problem solving becomes circular rumination that returns to the same themes of betrayal and distrust.	Anguish.

32. And it's like I'll go through the scenario, and I'll come to one, two, three different resolutions. But, I say, OK those are the resolutions. And then I just somehow, I end up back at the same place worrying about how I'll (garbled) you know, be feeling lonely, I guess loneliness is the feeling.	The appearance of rational problem solving defers to rumination over abandonment and loneliness.	Rumination.
33. And a lack of, ah, connectedness and, and sort of feeling incomplete, ah, if I'm not in a relationship with, with a woman. I think I really do enjoy, you know, (her). I quite like her. And, ah, the fact is I, I, ah, want to, be with her.	The significance of emotional attachment and perception of existential emptiness without it.	Dependence.
34. Ah, the humiliation aspect, ah, again where, you know, I would get drunk and stoned. And I would be made the butt of jokes. Ah, that bothered me, but, you know, I couldn't stop the drinking or the smoking.	History of social humiliation associated with substance abuse.	Fragile Self.
35. So ah, then we broke up, and that left me very despondent. I became alcoholic, ah, even more so. Every time it gets worse.	Earlier failed relationship was emotionally distressing.	Attachment.

36. Ah started off in relationships, but sort of tentatively. I felt myself to be ah, sort of socially retarded in some aspects by the fact that I hadn't been, you know, in a relationship that had been satisfactory for a period of a couple of years.	Social inadequacy experience.	Fragile Self.
37. I'd gone into a relationship with a, you know first love, and it was, you know, everything was fine. But then, another guy, older guy came along, and you know, was more knowledgeable in the ways of the world, etc., etc. And ah, I was really dumped like a dog at the side of the road more or less, and ah, I read in this, ah, self-help book that drugs were the replacement for love.	Responds to demise of his first love experience by turning to substance abuse.	Attachment.
38. It's been like a roller coaster. From elation and joy and feeling everything's fine, to despondency and real fear. It's a full gamut. It's literally I would say like an emotional roller coaster.	Characterization of his marital relationship as emotional instability.	Anguish.

39.

Trying to stop these negative thoughts before I get on the track. That it's like a train hurtling towards an abyss. If you don't put the breaks on at a certain point you're going, just going off into the dark.	Insight into the need to control rumination or he will be drawn into the unknown.	Constraint.

APPENDIX FIVE

Thematic Abstractions of Rick's Experience

Meaning Unit	Paraphrase	Theme
1. Ah, basically like she'd get me that angry that I'd start, you know, I'd put my fist through a wall, whatever. If I did harm physically, it was to myself.	Experience of externally precipitated anger turned to self inflicted injury.	Anger.
2. I'd put my fist through the wall, I'd stick my head through the wall, whatever, like to get the anger away from me.	Conscious attempt to purge himself of anger.	Anger.
3. A couple of times I have, ah, I did when she was on holiday there, like the two months prior to us breaking up, before she came back. Ah, I felt like abuse on the phone from her. And ah, she'd put the phone down on me, or whatever, and I'd rip the phone off the wall and throw it across the room. But I was entirely on my own at that time.	Experience of rejection precipitates anger expressed through property destruction.	Repudiation.
4. I feel that she could bring out the worst in me. She knew how to, you know, quick turn on that fuse.	Immediate, externally precipitated negative emotion.	Anger.

5. Hurt, pain . . . You just build up like you're going to explode and you've got to do something. And you've got to do something. And I was never one, I could never hit her, and so I'd just walk up to something and just take it, you know, like I say, put my fist through a wall, through a door, or whatever. It didn't happen that often, but, because I was able to hold myself back, you know.	Externally initiated emotional pain, invokes a compulsion to retaliate that is redirected to damage to self and property.	Anguish. Anger. Constraint.
6. You feel there's just no where to turn. Ah, and nothing to hold you back.	Feeling trapped and out of control	Constraint.
7. That was frustrating. Just the anger of it, the ah, the part where there's no answer to it. And you, you can't think of why you'd do this or, there's, there's just no answer to it, you know. And then like, she had reasons to believe that, in a way, but she would never believe me, that I didn't. And so it was frustrating that I couldn't make her believe that I hadn't eh.	Anger rooted in feeling stuck, helpless, and hopelessness about garnering her trust and faith.	Anger. Constraint.

8. And then she just kept prolonging it. Ah, she was getting mad for me phoning everyday. But I just wanted to talk to her and say hi. And all I basically wanted to hear from her was that she was missing me, but I'd never hear that. And, I'd never hear, she would never let her feelings show.	Seeks, but is denied, emotional attachment affirmation.	Repudiation.
9. So we went there and, just started, you know, basically she was dancing with him all night, the father. And they was just acting like, you know, a boy, a new boy friend and girl friend type of thing, eh, a new romantic love affair sort of thing you know. And that was ah, that was hard on me seeing it. And you know there was no stop to it eh.	Emotional pain of jealousy and perceived rejection.	Anguish.
10. Well ah, what's going on here? A father and a daughter acting like this, you know. I've never seen this before, so it didn't seem right to me. I thought well, what's he doing? Is he going to bed with her now? He's already done one daughter, is he doing the other daughter now?	Perplexed and concerned, he speculates about the relationship between his wife and her father.	Rumination.

11. And then, anyway she came home, and, ah, so, somehow we got into it. We got arguing. And then, she's sitting down at the dining room table with her dad and they're holding hands, and they're both arguing at me, calling me down, you know, calling me an asshole.	Degradation experience from an alliance that includes his wife, from whom he seeks affirmation, and aggrivated by a blatant show of affection toward another.	Repudiation.
12. So, so I felt well, if I don't go and then I guess, like this is what I'm thinking in my mind, if I don't go, then ah, I look the asshole, that sort of thing eh. You know I look like I'm the one who's causing the trouble. So, I says, yah, OK, I'll come.	Perceives that he is trapped and helpless.	Rumination.
13. So, and, basically, it's like I said I was being all ignored. Ah, they running around chasing one another around the fields, like my wife and her father, chasing one another, like a couple of kids.	Perception of being alone and emotionally abondoned is intensified by her displays of affection to her father.	Repudiation.

14. Like for instance, we was all laying sort of around the camp fire sort of thing. And her dad's laying there, and I'm laying there. And she comes up and she lays down with her dad and puts her head on her father eh. And looks at me while she's doing it.	He perceives her as flaunting her rejection of him and her attachment to her father. Emotional pain of rejection is implicit.	Repudiation.
15. I've never felt so much pain in all my life. It was, it hurt. It did. Yah. If I could have left then. If I'd had a vehicle, I would have just, bye, see you.	Intense emotional pain.	Anguish.
16. Just ah, . . . Just a hurt, really bad hurt, hurt. You know, makes you feel like you could just burst into tears, and you know. And in that situation you don't want to see people. So you're doing that. So you're just trying your hardest just to keep your, keep cool.	Experience of intense emotinal pain that he tries to control, accompanied by shame.	Anguish.
17. And what, what's going through my mind too is what the fuck went on in the States, while she was up there, right, you know?	Speculates about her infidelity.	Rumination.

18. I was going to do away with myself, you know. Just felt, what's, what's the point of living anymore? Is there, what's, you know, is there any, anything for me to stay here for? You know. Like I don't really have any family. I just felt like, you know, just go and do whatever. End it.	The significance of his marital attachment is illustrated by the severity of his response to the demise of the relationship.	Dependence.
19. I felt lost without her while she was away. I wanted her back.	Feels abandoned and alone.	Dependence.
20. Terrible then, because I, was, I went anywhere, I didn't enjoy myself because all I had, it was her on my mind, wondering what she was doing. Really I was allowing her to control my life because that's all that was on my mind.	Feels unhappy without her, and controlled by obsessive thoughts about her.	Constraint.
21. Not knowing sort of, ah, not knowing what to do and where to go. Not having many friends at all. You know, you're alone. Ah, basically, it's like she was my friend, not just my wife eh, my companion. And, so there was a sense of loss there.	Experience of isolation, aloneness, and loss.	Dependence.

22. She's controlling. She can control me. You know . . . She put me, she can put me down. She put me down. If you know.	Experiences her disparaging remarks as having control over him.	Constraint.
23. Putting me down, like you know, I don't want to see my children. And it hurt, that hurts me. Um, things are more important, I'm, ah, what else? She said, everybody else is more important than your children. And then she starts to make me start thinking if this is true or not.	Experiences her accusations of neglect of the children as painful, and doubts himself.	Anguish. Rumination.
24. When I had ah, my, like after I left her, I felt that I was worthless, you know, good for nothing. That maybe I wasn't even attractive enough to get somebody else sort of thing and all this, you know. I just felt like, well, you know, what's the point.	Loss of the relationship and children invokes self depreciation and hopelessness.	Dependence.

END

10-03-96

FIN